UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE SIXTIES STUDENT MOVEMENTS IN FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS.

BY

JULIAN P. DAVIES ©

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN
PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING 1991

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Canadian Theses Service

Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-66642-0

Canadä

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR:............................Julian Paul Davies

TITLE OF THESIS: The Sixties Student Movements in France and
the United States: A Comparative Analysis.

DEGREE:...Master of Arts

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED:.................................1991

PERMISSION IS HEREBY GRANTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY TO REPRODUCE SINGLE COPIES OF THIS THESIS AND TO LEND OR SELL SUCH COPIES FOR PRIVATE, SCHOLARLY OR SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH PURPOSES ONLY.

THE AUTHOR RESERVES OTHER PUBLICATION RIGHTS, AND NEITHER THE THESIS NOR EXTENSIVE EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE WITHOUT THE AUTHOR'S WRITTEN PERMISSION.

J.P. Da
Student's signature

10738 85 Ave
Student's Permanent Address

Date: 19th December 1990

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

THE UNDERSIGNED CERTIFY THAT THEY HAVE READ, AND RECOMMENDED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH FOR ACCEPTANCE, A THESIS ENTITLED "The Sixties Student Movements in France and the United States: A Comparative Analysis" SUBMITTED BY Julian Davies IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF Master of Arts.

Dr. L. Aronsen (co-supervisor)

Patricia E. Prestwich

Dr. P. Prestwich (co-supervisor)

Dr. B. Smith

Dr. W. Meloff

C. Small (Chair)

Date: 19th December 1990

ABSTRACT

The 1960s witnessed college and university campus unrest on an unprecedented scale. In 1968 particularly, students across the world were simultaneously rebelling against authority in countries as diverse as Mexico, Germany, India, France, Japan, and the United States. It is somewhat surprising therefore, that few scholarly works have addressed the subject of the Sixties student movements in the form of a comparison. This study takes two of the countries involved, France and the United States, compares the internal ideological developments of the students movements in each country, and assesses the impact of differing traditions of radicalism on the ideology and behaviour of the students.

A thesis is developed which suggests that the American student movement paid little attention to past radical traditions in its attempt to devise a critique of society, and thus lacked any real ideological depth, instead concentrating its energies on addressing the immediate injustices of others. The French student movement on the other hand was always referring back to its revolutionary traditions, was constantly redefining itself ideologically, and therefore did not suffer the same problems of instability which so characterised the development of the New Left in the United States.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my two supervisors, Professor Lawrence Aronsen and Professor Patricia Prestwich, for helping me to develop this thesis, and for providing me with invaluable guidance throughout. I would also like to acknowledge Peter Stead, lecturer at University College Swansea, for originally sparking my enthusiasm for the topic. Finally, recognition must also go to the following individuals: Bob Irwin and David Fielding for helping me on the road to computer literacy, Timothy Wild for discussions over coffee, and especially my family for their support and encouragement throughout.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

Abstract...

Acknowledgements...

List of Abbreviations....................................

INTRODUCTION..1

    Endnotes...21

CHAPTER ONE..24

    Endnotes...70

CHAPTER TWO..79

    Endnotes..108

CHAPTER THREE...114

    Endnotes..150

CONCLUSION..158

    Endnotes..162

BIBLIOGRAPHY..163

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

FRANCE

CA:	*Comité d'Action*.
CAL:	*Comité(s) d'Action Lycéen(s)* (School student action committees).
CFDT:	*Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail* (French Democratic Workers Confederation).
CGT:	*Confédération Générale du Travail* (General Confederation of Labour).
CVB:	*Comité Vietnam de Base*.
CVN:	*Comité Vietnam National*.
ESU:	*Etudiants Socialistes Unifiés*.
FER:	*Fédération des Etudiants Révolutionnaires* (trotskyist).
IS:	*Internationale Situationniste*.
JCR:	*Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire* (trotskyist).
M22M:	*Mouvement du 22 Mars*.
OCI:	*Organisation Communiste Internationaliste* (trotskyist).
PCF:	*Parti Communiste Français*.
PCI:	*Parti Communiste Internationaliste* (trotskyist).
PCMLF:	*Parti Communiste Marxiste-Leniniste de France* (maoist).
SNESup:	*Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Supérieur* (National Union of University Lecturers).
UEC(F):	*Union des Etudiants Communistes (de France)*.
UJC(ml):	*Union des Jeunesse Communistes (marxistes-leninistes)* (maoist)
UNEF:	*Union Nationale des Etudiants de France* (National Students Union)
VO:	*Voix Ouvrière* (trotskyist)

UNITED STATES

CPUSA:	Communist Party USA.
ERAP:	Economic Research and Action Project.
FSM:	Free Speech Movement (Berkeley).
M2M:	May 2nd Movement (Anti-Vietnam War group).
PLP:	Progressive Labour Party (maoist).
REP:	Radical Education Project.
SDS:	Students for a Democratic Society.
SMC:	Student Mobilisation Committee (Anti-Vietnam).
SWP:	Socialist Workers Party (trotskyist).
YPSL:	Young People's Socialist League (trotskyist).
YSA:	Young Socialist Alliance (trotskyist).

THE SIXTIES STUDENT MOVEMENT IN FRANCE AND THE UNITED STATES

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

Comparison can be an invaluable technique in historical analysis. In the case of the student movements of the turbulent Sixties, the comparative dimension permits an examination into the impact of differing national political traditions on the motivations and actions of the students. It is important to keep in mind when studying the student upheaval of the 1960s that it was very much an international phenomenon. Although the worldwide student riots provoked much contemporary writing[1] and have continued to fascinate more scholarly researchers since, few works if any, have given much thought to a comparative angle on the movements. Similarly, very little literature has appeared addressing the ideological influences upon the social upheaval which occurred two decades ago.[2] This study proposes to examine both of these neglected areas by combining them within the contexts of two advanced industrial capitalist societies: France and the United States.

There were, surprisingly enough, certain striking similarities between these two societies beset with internal dissension and strife in the Sixties. To begin with, both were highly industrialised capitalist countries with a large working class population and liberal democratic political systems. Hence, unlike Lenin's or Trotsky's Russia, Mao's China or Castro's Cuba, France and the U.S. both conformed to these aforementioned specifications, which Marx and Engels had stipulated as vital to the optimum transition from capitalism to socialism. Also, it is probably fair to say that both preserved quite severe inequalities in the distribution of their wealth, whether these were based on regional differences, ethnic or sexual discrepancies or purely employer-employee distinctions.

A further interesting point of comparison between France and the United States was that between them, they had been the most militarily active of the western capitalist industrialised countries since the end of the Second World War. Indeed, since 1945, both had been engaged in wars against Third World peoples. The French were active in Indochina until 1954 and then in the late fifties in Algeria, whilst for their part, the U.S. financially aided France in Indochina, fought in Korea and Vietnam and was involved in various shorter encounters with, amongst others, Guatemala, Angola, Cuba and Chile.

These military engagements were also instrumental in the development of another similarity between the two countries, namely, the youth radicalisation of the 1960s. Both survived one postwar military encounter without much internal dissension, but neither remained unscathed after a second attempt. The Algerian conflict served to politicise the student youth in France, whilst the transformation of the New Left into a mass political force did not occur in the U.S. until major military intervention was underway in Southeast Asia.

The student population in both France and the U.S. (admittedly to varying degrees) attacked a variety of over-centralised structures, particularly in the educational arena. It would seem that educational systems were viewed by students in the Sixties as bureaucratic vehicles geared to churning out mindless cogs in the system, both militarily to fight imperialist wars and economically to increase the power of huge corporations. It is quite clear that the relationships between radicalised youth and the 'establishment' showed quite marked similarities at the height of the movement in the later 1960s. However, an examination of the nature of the French university system will also serve to explain the greater magnitude of the educational crisis there.

Also, although generally numerically weak, the extremist ideological parties under the direction of Trotskyist, Maoist and Marxist-Leninist theories, experienced a remarkable revitalisation in the shadow of, or alongside the student movements in both France and the U.S. This should be qualified for two reasons. Firstly, there were quite dramatic variations in aims, influences, and impact of these groups in each country. As well, this general increase in popularity was understandable considering the sensitivity of these groups towards such issues as the extreme centralisation and bureaucratisation of western (and indeed eastern) European industrial societies, and in particular, their special appeal to youth which could only enhance their attraction.

Particular attention in the study is given to the leadership of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in the U.S. and the March 22nd Movement (M22M) in France. The justification for this selection lies in the fact that both of these groups initiated the wave of rebellion in their respective countries - SDS with the "Port Huron Statement" in 1962 and the M22M at the University of Paris, Nanterre in 1968. This selection may at first seem a little inappropriate, since if one were to examine the structures of both organisations, the hierarchical party-like style of the SDS would appear to come into conflict with the highly unstructured neo-anarchistic nature of Daniel Cohn-Bendit's inspiration, the M22M.[3] Hence, a brief attempt will be made here to justify the decision made to select these two groups and to emphasise the vital importance of both in any study of the New Left in the 1960s.

The SDS was an organisation looked upon as a tactical and ideological leader, especially by the time of the major antiwar demonstrations. It was also effectively and practically an initiator of the true New Left movement in the

U.S. What New Left historian Ehud Sprinzak has called the 'crisis of confidence' in American society came, not so much with the original ideas of C. Wright Mills and Herbert Marcuse, but with the 1962 initiative of the SDS, the "Port Huron Statement":

> "It was only with the establishment of the SDS in 1962 that a concrete collectivity intending to engage in social and political action identified itself with these ideas (Mills, Marcuse, etc.) under a broad creed."[4]

As well as being the original spark in the movement, the SDS acted as an umbrella for just about every important ideological current encountered in the United States at the time. By remaining unfocused and inchoate, SDS grew into the largest radical organisation on hundreds of campuses, the catchall for every idealist, pacifist, humanist and reformer, as well as doctrinaire Maoist or Trotskyist.

Similar points could be made as regards the M22M in France. Without a doubt, the actions of the Nanterre activists provided a detonator or catalyst for the developments which unfolded in Paris at the beginning of May 1968.[5] As well, the radicals of the M22M were the first in France to create the Comités d'Action, which were to provide a fundamental structural feature of the May movement in France. Their Comités d'Action Révolutionnaire were the first to appear in the May crisis, the Maoists following up later with their Comités pour le soutien du peuple.[6] Also, the members of the M22M, more than any other group, appreciated the potentialities of student-worker cooperation and acted upon that. As American historian, A. Belden Fields pointed out in 1969:

> "The magnitude of student and worker participation took almost everybody by surprise. The exception was perhaps Cohn-Bendit and the small group of students around him who shared his Sorelian theories. But all of the other pre-existing organisations unexpectedly found themselves riding the tiger of a spontaneous wave of political and social consciousness which extended itself to young workers and young people in almost all endeavors."[7]

The student revolt was only made possible in France by the overarching capacity of the M22M, the only transcending organisation of May 1968. It embodied the true 'esprit' behind the student revolt.[8]

In the French case in particular, because of the confusion of the May riots, many contemporary reports gave conflicting views as to which groups were specifically responsible for the Paris revolt.[9] Various groups and organisations at the time, and indeed since, have been mistakenly credited for a leading role in the events of May. Numerous factions gave the impression at the time of being prominent in the crisis, but often it was a case of plenty of noise but little substance. For example, as Jane Decker pointed out:

> "Ongoing newspaper accounts emphasised the

> importance and centrality of UNEF (the Union National des Etudiants Français the national student union in France) during the revolt; the emphasis was misplaced. UNEF provided a public, and to a lesser extent an actual umbrella. It encouraged the view of itself as a spokesman. Actually, UNEF had nothing to do, in the months before May with escalating student agitation beyond university centred demands."[10]

Although at the time UNEF and the Syndicat National de L'Enseignement Supérieur (SNESup, the national teachers' union) were frequently blamed by the media, (press coverage always centred on Alain Geismar and Jacques Sauvageot) most of the time they in fact acted as restraints rather than stimulants to the violence and spontaneity. The National Students Union was hardly acknowledged by the ultra-leftists during May and, in effect, it did little more than attempt to lead the strike once it was already in full swing.

It has also been suggested by some commentators that the existential strains of the anti-society Parisian intelligentsia had a significant influence upon the direction of the May Movement.[11] Predictably enough, most literary figures from the Left Bank and Latin Quarter, including Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir, were quite willing to lend support to the movement, but they were not directly influential in its instigation. In general, French intellectuals, so often the initiators of insurrection and dissent, were distinctly followers in 1968. American historian Daniel Singer makes the point in his book on the

May revolt, Prelude to Revolution:

> "Surprised, like everybody else by the crisis, the intellectuals had little time in which to improvise new structures.... Essentially, the intellectuals merely echoed the main message of May, the violent protest against the existing social order."[12]

Also followers, and indeed a long way behind, were the various traditional anarchist groups in France, such as the Federation Anarchiste Française and Les Hommes Libres. Not only did these groups drag their feet along in the wake of the student violence, but when they actually attempted to take a part in the movement, much of their writings appear to have been a mundane reiteration of outdated 'turn of the century' manifestoes.[13]

It needs to be made clear from the outset that there is a crucial distinction in terms of time between the two student movements. This study deals with the U.S. movement from its founding document, the "Port Huron Statement" in 1962, to the year of the Columbia and Chicago riots in 1968, whilst the French discussion centres primarily on the events of May and June 1968 in Paris. It is clear that the evolutionary development of the American New Left contrasts sharply with the far more volatile French student revolt. However, a comparison should not be seen as unfeasible, since this discrepancy merely serves to illustrate some interesting insights about each country's historical traditions regarding social change.

A history of the American new left of the 1960s would most appropriately begin with the creation of the SDS's founding document, the "Port Huron Statement".[14] This statement was the resultant document of a week-long conference attended by a handful of disgruntled white middle class graduate students at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor in April 1962. It was not a revolutionary document by any means, but it did express some doubts about contemporary American society, not least in its opening sentence, which read: "We look uneasily to the world we inherit".[15] It was basically a moral document appealing to the conscience of the American nation, and it effectively created an ideological platform for the New Left in the United States. SDS had originally risen to prominence in the early Sixties as a result of its participation in the civil rights issue in the southern states. However, the "Port Huron Statement" brought the qualitative leap which translated SDS's morally based actions in the south into an ideology capable of mobilising white students in the north, and in doing so created a comprehensive critique of contemporary American society.

1964 saw the development of a scheme by SDS for creating an inter-racial movement of the poor, the Economic Research and Action Projects (ERAP). These projects focused SDS's energies for the following two years, but failed dismally in an attempt to integrate the poor into a radical movement. In

1964 in fact, radical attention was shifted from SDS in Chicago to the University of California campus at Berkeley, where the spontaneous Free Speech Movement (FSM) caused havoc with its street demonstrations and riots. These riots were in response primarily to what the students considered to be heavy-handed paternalism on the part of the university administration, especially in its decision to ban political campaigning on the campus. The FSM opened up an arena of dissent that made students feel their right to protest. It also prepared the terrain for the type of actions that would shortly become widespread across the United States in response to the dominant mobilising force of the New Left, the Vietnam War.

The years 1965 to 1967 saw an ever increasing radicalism in the American New Left, influenced mainly by the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Anti-war demonstrations in Washington DC and New York attracted upwards of 125,000 participants, as students brought the war in Vietnam home. By the end of 1967 and the beginning of 1968, more violent confrontations were being witnessed across the U.S. American society certainly seemed to be reaching a time of crisis, with assassinations, race riots and student occupations of campuses dominating newspaper headlines. At Columbia University in New York on April 23rd 1968, the SDS led an uprising that would become a model for campus confrontation in the late Sixties. The sit-in of Hamilton Hall by radical students was ended violently by the intervention of the police a week later on April 30th, and the University did not function for the remainder of the semester. Violence also broke out between demonstrating students and police in August 1968 at the Democratic Convention in Chicago. The height of U.S. involvement in Vietnam in 1968 coincided directly with the peak of violence at home. By this time, the New Left was almost entirely dependent on the anti-war movement for its mass support, and indeed as criticisms of the war began to die down at the end of the 1960s, so the support base of the SDS began to wane.

The French student revolt in the Sixties was a far more abrupt phenomenon than the movement in the U.S. The événements of May and June 1968 in Paris were probably the high point of all the student movements in the 1960s.[16] For two months, France was brought to a standstill by a movement sparked off by student grievances. Student discontent had been festering since 1965 in France based on both university problems and the increasing American presence in Vietnam. However, beginning in the autumn of 1967, the agitation over the war in Indochina and over the growing university crisis converged. The Fouchet Plan (set up by the Ministry of Education to split university degrees into teaching and research diplomas at different academic levels) was put into full operation just as universities were taking in the largest influx of new students to that date. Student political interest was revived in this atmosphere, and examples of students actively participating in factory disputes at Caen and Le Mans in February 1968 were not isolated. Particularly significant was the creation of a new revolutionary movement, the March 22nd Movement under the inspiration of a 23 year old German born sociology student, Daniel "Dany the Red" Cohn-Bendit. This group, set up at the Nanterre campus of the University of Paris, was to be the most important revolutionary student group involved in the May riots.

When, on May 3rd 1968, the Rector of the University of Paris, Paul Roché, called in the police to disperse a crowd of students that had gathered in the courtyard of the Sorbonne, he inadvertantly created the spark which was to ignite two months of street fighting that almost brought the French government to its knees. Six hundred or more students were arrested that day, and the following Monday (the 5th) students marched through the Latin Quarter of Paris demanding the liberation of the arrested students. For a week, street confrontations continued between students and police, and then, on May 10th, the government gave orders for the police to clear the streets. On the "Nights of the Barricades" (May 10th and 11th), students overturned cars and trucks and pulled up the pavés (cobblestones) of the Paris streets, to create barricades against the police onslaught. Two nights of extreme violence caused the government to retreat temporarily, and as the university faculties were reopened and the police withdrew from the Latin Quarter, the students rushed in and retook the streets on the Left Bank around the Sorbonne. This move marked the beginning of a month-long student occupation of the Sorbonne: the Sorbonne soviet.[17]

On Monday May 13th, a one day General Strike was called by the main national trades union, the Confédération Générale du Travail, and in response, up to a million people marched through the streets of Paris. The following day, at the Sud Aviation works at Nantes, the workers seized control of the factory, and this precedent was followed in the subsequent week by workers all over France. By the end of May, ten million workers (two-thirds of the entire workforce) were on strike. The country was effectively paralysed.

For six days, from the 26th to the 31st of May, the city of Nantes in southern Brittany was the scene of what could effectively be called an autonomous soviet. A Central Strike Committee representing workers, peasants and students set itself up in the town hall, directly challenging the local prefect's power. However, the Nantes Commune, like the rest of the French revolt was relatively short-lived, and indeed, the crisis days of May and June were followed by a massive swing to the Gaullists in the July elections.

Obviously there were limitations to the student movements in both countries, indicated by the relative abruptness of their demise in and after 1968. Indeed, some idea needs to be given as to the actual scope of the influence of the main ideological groups. Undoubtedly, not all the students involved in the campus unrest of the Sixties were actively involved in a conscious radical crusade. Many became involved out of an emotional reaction towards police repression, whilst for some it was a purely expedient revolt. As Edward Shils has quite accurately pointed out: "The students whose moral sensibilities are affronted by repressive action are much more numerous than the student radicals."[18] For the most part, the influences of the extremist ideological groups were of relevance to only a minority. In neither France nor the United States did the radical students really convince a large proportion of the population to their violent ideas of revolutionary change. The total membership in France of the Trotskyist Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire (JCR), the M22M and the Etudiants Socialistes Unifiés (ESU) combined came to no more than 2,900 activists, whilst in the U.S. a Harris Poll in the Spring of 1968 estimated a number of somewhere between 80,000 and 100,000 genuinely radical student activists (1%-2% of the student population).[19] Although the French students forced the two major trades unions, (the Confédération Générale du Travail and the Confédération Française Démocratique du Travail) into a temporary alliance unique in a western democracy, and persuaded numerous young workers to abandon their non-revolutionary unions, the main body of the working class maintained a purely defensive and hence economic conception of the General Strike.[20] On the other hand, few campaigns were even attempted on the working class in the

United States. Only the Maoists of the Progressive Labour Party advocated a policy of courting the workers. SDS was almost totally isolated from the problems and resentments of ordinary American workers. Lawrence Lader has emphasised this essential impotency of the New Left: "At Columbia, the New Left could not even hold its tenuous alliance with the black radical students, much less make inroads into the Harlem working class."[21]

In France, where attempts at worker control of the workplace might suggest at least an experiment of Trotsky's 'Dual Power' method of revolution, the reality was slightly less advanced. With the possible exception of the Nantes Commune (seen by Bernard Brown as "the beginnings of Dual Power") [22], most of the Action Committees and strike committees which spread across France in May and June 1968 dealt with expedient and immediate measures required, such as supporting strikers' families, rather than creating alternative centres of production and power. Daniel Singer assessed the true significance of these committees:

> "It is quite easy to quote a score of examples of strikes run by basic committees or by general Assemblies meeting every day....but at very few factories was production actually restarted by the strikers."[23]

So, the revolutionary element in the Sixties student revolts was for the most part, numerically negligible. Usually, it took events or situations far beyond the control of the extremists to rally the great majority of the student body into radical activity.

The first part of chapter one deals with the radical traditions existing in both countries, providing some insight into the impact of past experiences of radicalism and revolutionary activity upon the stability and potency of each student radical movement. Following that is an examination of how the 1960s movements departed from previous generations of radicals; this section attempts to pinpoint certain factors exclusive to the 1960s that provided catalysts to the student revolts. In other words, what made the New Left particularly 'new'? Much of the politicisation and radicalisation which characterised the youth of the Sixties can be seen as a response to phenomena ranging from the inefficiencies of centralised, bureaucratic authorities (particularly within the university) to the polarising influence of what the students defined as "American Imperialism", more specifically, the Vietnam War. It will be illustrated in this last case that there were fundamentally differing motivations involved in the French and American situations. As one would imagine in each country, circumstances dictated that the relative potency of these influential factors would vary quite markedly and as such, these discrepancies are examined in the first chapter.

The discussion of ideology in the Sixties movements, concentrated in chapters two and three, has been restricted to the influences upon the speechmakers, the contributors to underground journals and writers of books or memoirs. This decision to select as a focus of attention the spokesmen or leaders, rather than the student body as a whole, was a practical one. Clearly a great deal of the information needed to form a truly complete picture of each movement as a whole is simply not available. The sources consulted include primary and secondary materials in both French and English, but priority was given mainly to documents from the 'Tracts de Mai' collection of leaflets and underground newspaper articles at the University of California, Berkeley for the French side of the study. American documents included underground newspaper collections at the University of Washington, Seattle, and in particular (since the focus of study was the SDS) the 'New Left Notes' from Chicago. Also included were periodic statements, speeches and declarations made by various SDS leaders throughout the Sixties which were printed as SDS working papers.

The second chapter specifically provides an insight into some of the original ideological influences behind the student movements in France and the U.S. This second chapter deals with the necessary importance of historical points of reference for any creators of a new movement's ideology. How did these movements justify their existence with the apparent rejection of 'old left' tendencies? This analysis includes an assessment of the possible references to historical figures: Nestor Makhno in the case of the M22M, and Marcuse, Mills and Goodman in the writings of the SDS leaders. For all their claims to be 'new', it is fair to say that all political action, including revolutionary politics must be undertaken within the context of pre-existing institutions and ideologies. Stress is placed on a comparison of certain strains of libertarianism in the U.S. student movement with perhaps more violence-oriented anarchist tendencies in the French case.

In chapter three, the focus turns towards an assessment of the influences of the traditional revolutionary theorists, and more specifically their more recent disciples, on the direction of both French and American movements. This chapter is a comparative study of the traditional ideologically extremist groups in France and the United States, inspired by such revolutionary icons as Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and Mao. As an introduction to this section, there is a brief assessment of the basic differences in the philosophical outlook and especially tactical methodology of these revolutionary theorists. The main theme of the discussion, however, is an examination of the attempts made by these diverse and tightly-knit sectarian groups to stamp their own specific ideological characters upon the student movement as a whole.

The second part of chapter three is an examination of the extent to which these extreme groups were successful in influencing the general phenomenon of the "Movement", and in particular its leadership. Here of course, lies one of the major problems faced when tackling such a study. There are obvious limitations to a study which attempts to assess the characteristics of a social phenomenon as vague as a 'movement'. What can one specifically pinpoint as the 'true character' of a 'movement'? Like any other form of social organisation, social movements have a centre and a periphery, (plus all that comes in between) so how does one define how the understanding and acceptance of a radical ideology permeates a movement? Behaviour will be looked at, plus strategy and tactics adopted, in an attempt to establish these assessments. At the end of the third chapter, an explanation is given as to why the infiltration by Trotskyist and especially Maoist groups of the SDS in the U.S. was resisted markedly less than similar attempts at influencing the student members of the M22M in France.

The conclusion to the thesis then reiterates the vital importance of both the necessary study of radical traditions for the student movements in France and the United States, and the need for any social movement to create and develop an ideology based on the lessons learned from those traditions. If anything can be gleaned from a comparison of the ideologies of the student movements in France and the U.S. in the Sixties, it is this. The American movement was based primarily on addressing immediate issues and problems which seemed to contradict the ideals inherent in the American Constitution, and was therefore essentially an expedient revolt. In France however, the revolt at all points in its development was characterised by a conscious harking back to the revolutionary traditions of France's turbulent past. The French movement never stopped defining itself ideologically.

ENDNOTES FOR INTRODUCTION

1. Most of the contemporary writing came from sociology professors. In the U.S, these included Seymour Martin Lipset and Kenneth Keniston, whilst in France, Raymond Aron and Alain Touraine supplied contemporary opinions. This is perhaps significant in the sense that the whole Sixties rebellion was essentially a rejection of the study of sociology as it existed in the 1960s, and indeed most of the revolts on campuses in France and the U.S. originated in sociology departments. The Sixties revolt was essentially an attempt to look at society in a radically different way.

2. There are exceptions to this pattern. For example, A. Belden Fields deals with the ideologies of the "old left" groups in the Sixties revolts in his work, Trotskyism and Maoism. Theory and Practice in France and the United States. (N.Y; Autonomedia, 1988) Also David Bouchier deals with ideology in his book Idealism and Revolution. New Ideologies of Liberation in Britain and the United States (London; Edward Arnold, 1978) One Ph.D thesis has dealt with the ideological framework of the New Left and that was by Ehud Sprinzak, "Democracy and Illegitimacy. A Study of the American and French student protest movements and some theoretical implications" (Ph.D thesis; Yale University, 1971).

3. For the organisational style of the 'Students for a Democratic Society' see the "Amended Constitution", appearing in the July 1966 edition of New Left Notes. For the March 22nd Movement's own impressions of its own structure and tactics see "Bulletin du Mouvement du 22 Mars" no. 5494, 26 April 1968.

4. From Sprinzak "Democracy and Illegitimacy" p.129. Mills and Marcuse will be dealt with, along with other relevant theorists, in greater detail later in this chapter.

5. For more details on Nanterre, see P. Seale and M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag: French Revolution 1968 (New York; G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1968)

6. Daniel Singer, Prelude to Revolution (N.Y; Hill & Wang, 1970) p.271.

7. A Belden Fields. From an article entitled "The Revolution Betrayed. The French Student Revolt. May-June 1968" from S.M. Lipset and P. Altbach (ed.) Students in Revolt (Boston; Little, Brown & Co, 1969) p.150. The influences of such theorists of irrationality in the 1890s as Sorel, Péguy and

Bergson will be discussed in further detail later in the chapter.

8. For Decker's interpretation see J.E. Decker "A Study in Revolutionary Theory: the French Student-Worker Revolt of May 1968". (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1972) p.189.

9. See in particular a report by the Préfecture de police dated the 11th of June entitled "L'aspect politique de la situation" which is a case in point of the complete confusion as to who was specifically responsible for the disturbances in Paris.

10. J.E. Decker, "A Study in Revolutionary Theory: The French Student Worker Revolt" p.186.

11. There seems to be a severe tendency in French intellectual circles to reduce vast social movements to philosophical quarrels between differing schools of thought. The revival of commitment and radicalism was hailed by many intellectuals as the revenge of existentialism over structuralism in 1968. Structuralism had gained ascendancy in philosophical circles in the 1950s and many believed that May 1968 was proof that man could rise above social structures. This suggestion that the philosophy of "existentialism" prevalent in intellectual circles had spilled over into the student radical milieu is, I believe, somewhat far fetched.

12. D. Singer, Prelude to Revolution p.262.

13. For an excellent example of this, see leaflet dated 25th May 1968 by the F.A.F. Sécrétariat aux Rélations Internationales entitled "Camarades!".

14. Taken from the "Port Huron Statement. Agenda for a Generation" (June, 1962) from M. Cohen & D. Hale, (ed.) The New Student Left: An Anthology (Boston; Beacon, 1966) p.3.

15. For excellent accounts of the rise of the SDS and the New Left in the United States, see Irwin Unger, The Movement: A History of the American New Left. 1959-1972 (N.Y; Harper & Row, 1974), R. Fraser, 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt (N.Y; Pantheon, 1988) pp.61-66, pp.89-95 & pp.101-141 and James Miller, "Democracy is in the Streets": From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago (N.Y; Simon & Schuster, 1987)

16. For more detailed descriptions of the events in Paris in May 1968, see B. Brown, Protest in Paris: Anatomy of a Revolt (New Jersey; General Learning Press, 1974) pp.2-30, R. Fraser, 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt pp.203-30 and P. Seale & M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag

17. For a detailed description of the student soviet at the Sorbonne, see P. Seale & M.McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag: French Revolution, 1968 pp.99-117.

18. Edward Shils "Dreams of plenitude, Nightmares of Scarcity" from Lipset and Altbach (ed.) Students in Revolt p.152.

19. For the French statistics see A. Belden Fields "The Revolution Betrayed: the French Student Revolt, May-June 1968" from Lipset and Altbach (ed.) Students in Revolt p.152.

For the American statistics see a pamphlet by R. Ellsworth and M. Burns entitled Student Activism in American Higher Education (Washington DC; The American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1970).

20. P. Seale & M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag p.232.

21. Laurence Lader, Power on the Left: American Radical Movements Since 1946. (N.Y; W.W. Norton, 1979) p.256.

22. B. Brown, Protest in Paris: Anatomy of a Revolt p.151.

23. D. Singer, Prelude to Revolution p.239.

CHAPTER ONE

The first part of this chapter will be an examination of the structural or long term issues involved in the Sixties student movements in France and the United States, followed by a more focused account of the specific short term causes of the disturbances. The structural discussion will revolve around the radical traditions in both countries, examining in particular the state of both the intellectual left and the industrial, organised working class in each case.

Once the scene has been set by this discussion, the study will move more specifically into the 1960s, focusing on the more immediate issues which precipitated the student revolts. The first to be dealt with will be the education crisis of the 1960s. This discussion will be divided into structural issues such as overcrowding and demands for autonomy, and more immediate issues such as localised sit-ins, demonstrations and student strikes.

The specific questioning of the education system naturally led students to develop a more widespread critique of the "establishment." The next section will deal with this, paying particular attention to an assessment of the mishandling of the student revolts by the authorities in the form of state and police repression.

Rounding up the chapter will be an analysis of the role played by the Vietnam war in the Sixties student movements. The war in Southeast Asia was undoubtedly one of the most important recruiters of mass support amongst the student population. The discussion here will centre on a comparison of the motives of the activists in their opposition to the war in France and the U.S. It will be argued that in the U.S, opposition to the war was (understandably) based on its immediacy in the form of casualty reports and the draft. It will also be pointed out however, that criticisms of the war by American students often developed into a general questioning of the global role of the U.S., based on morality and conscience. On the other hand, it will be suggested that amongst French student radicals, opposing the war in Vietnam tended to be based more on ideological issues such as support for nationalist and revolutionary causes in the Third World, of which Indochina was only one case.

Beginning with long term factors involved in the student movements in the Sixties, an understanding of radical political traditions is crucial in appreciating both the original characteristics of the movements and their chronological development to their demise at the end of that decade. Ultimately, either a neglect for, or an intricate understanding of the history of radical and revolutionary traditions in either country determined the ideological direction of the revolts in France and the U.S. Originally, both the French and American student movements set out to distance themselves from the 'old left' wranglings and factional conflicts of previous generations. Both intended to create something new, something original. However, by 1968 in the United States, there were very few 'new' leftists remaining. The Students for a Democratic Society by this time was characterised by rhetorical speeches and pointless and polemical internal debates amongst factional groups battling for control within the movement. SDS had been irrevocably split into numerous ideological directions. In France however, the New Left in the form of the 'May Movement' had historical traditions to hark back to (unlike its American equivalent, the SDS) and it had derived a certain stability from this. In contrast to the ideologically unarmed leaders of the SDS, the New Left in France had concrete doctrinal and ideological answers to the probing and threatening questions of the predatory old 'vanguard' left. To understand the different reactions of the New Left leaders to their 'old left' adversaries in the two countries, and the ways they dealt with this threat, it is necessary to now take a brief look at the radical traditions in each case.

In France, there is a constant and powerful radical tradition dating back to the days of the French Revolution. A French mentalité has been developed since the Revolution, characterised by a less than respectful treatment of the constitution. Since 1789, the French Constitution has changed some eight or nine times[1], illustrating quite clearly that in

France, constitutions have not so much been seen as the fundamental framework of the political system, but more as devices and weapons to be used or changed by political forces when circumstances have dictated. Governmental instability has been a central characteristic of French politics, particularly since the days of the Third Republic.[2] Political 'families' were established and accepted in France after the Revolution, each with their own part to play in political life. Radicalism and socialism were therefore accepted as readily as other, more traditional 'families' such as Bonapartism, republicanism and monarchism.[3] The fragility of the French constitution leads to a conclusion that there is always a more potentially explosive situation in a radical movement in France than in the United States.[4] As Alain Touraine, French sociologist at the Sorbonne in May 1968, has written:

> "France has had five republics and would have no particular difficulty adjusting to a sixth....French society is more open than the United States to social change."[5]

In the United States on the other hand, there is no such revolutionary tradition. Since the creation of the U.S. Constitution in the late Eighteenth Century, there have been no radical changes in either constitution or government. It is a relatively youthful nation which has sought to create and uphold an identity, and as such respects and defends its constitution implicitly.

Ehud Sprinzak completed one of the only comparative studies on the French and American student movements to date for his Ph.D. at Yale University in 1971. In his study, he related these differences regarding attitudes towards the constitution with the revolts of the French and American students in the Sixties. He called the revolt in the United States only a 'crisis of confidence', because of the traditional American respect for the constitution, whilst terming the insurgence in France a 'crisis of illegitimacy', because of its revolutionary traditions. He clarifies:

> "After all, the use of symbols of illegitimacy against one's political rivals and the consequent revolutionary terminology is as traditionally French as the respect for the constitution is American.....A person disappointed with the existing political order in France, particularly a young student, had at his disposal a powerful symbology of illegitimacy to turn to and powerful organisation to rely on. The cultural traditions of the left made it impractical to spend much time on doubts regarding the openness of the system or its capacity to correct itself in a democratic way."[6]

The almost fervent American defence of the constitution has brought with it a certain intolerance of anything appearing to threaten the status quo. As such, any political movement of left orientation, be it Socialist, Communist, Anarchist or Libertarian Socialist, has always been on the fringes of society. There is nothing at all intrinsic about American radicalism. What radicalism has surfaced in American history (such as the IWW Wobblies in the early twentieth century and the Communist Party in the 1930s and 1940s.) has usually been fairly covert or otherwise immediately repressed by the authorities.[7] As a result of this repression, (plus internal divisions over tactics) an already marginal Communist Party was split into even smaller groups,[8] and if there were any traces of anarchism or syndicalism in groups like the Wobblies, they hardly survived to the 1960s. All of this has caused a deep disjunction between generations of American radicals. That is to say that there was little interconnection between the student radicals of the 1960s and the older communists and socialists, because the latter had virtually withered away during the McCarthy-influenced repression of the 1950s.[9] It needs to be pointed out at this juncture however, that the student activists of SDS have also been criticised for consciously cutting themselves off from any radical past they might have had. They were hence unable to profit from studying the successes and failures of the left in the U.S. in and before the 1930s.[10] The American student radicals were impatient with the concerns of the 'old left' and felt they had nothing to learn from the history of communism.[11] This was a fatal mistake.

France on the other hand, has a history full of incidents of influential radicalism. The left has attempted to take control of France on numerous occasions in modern French history. The Revolution of 1848 saw the student-inspired street fighting and barricades, which have often been likened to the 1968 revolt,[12] whilst 1871 witnessed further insurgence in Paris in the form of the Commune. Socialism became a particularly powerful force in France in the 1880s and 1890s, inspired by such influential figures as Jean Jaurès and Georges Sorel.[13] The first half of the twentieth century saw further attempts by the French socialists and communists to control the government of France: in 1936 in the form of the Popular Front government under Leon Blum, and in the 1945 elections when the communists, standing as the party of la patrie after their achievements in the Resistance, came close to success.

Hence the events of May 1968 need to be viewed in the overall context of a long French tradition of radical thought and activity. Many of the ideas of the student revolutionaries in 1968 came from various strains of the French left in the nineteenth century: Blanquism, Proudhonism and Guesdism amongst others. In particular, the popular ideas of anarcho-syndicalism in Paris in 1968 can be traced back to the revolutionary-syndicalism of the late nineteenth century and Georges Sorel.[14] This point can be emphasised by reference to an article written by a group of American students who had come into contact with French student activists in Paris during the May revolt, in the SDS underground newspaper, New Left Notes:

> "One reason for the Movement's rapid growth is that the French students were not new to radical thought, no matter how new this generation was to action. Every

> activist we met was some shade of marxist however unorthodox, however tinged with anarchism, Reichian psychology or whatever."[15]

The French militants active in May/June 1968 always had radical or revolutionary historical references to work from to defend any stance they were taking, as a declaration by the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire on the 21st May 1968 illustrates:

> "The young workers and the students who are in the thick of the battle do not want their fight to end in the same way as the 1936 and 1945 movements."[16]

Invariably, the French students were consciously harking back to the lessons of the past. Hence, any doctrinal or organisational differences were not as devastating to the movement as a whole as was the case in the United States. The American students frequently paid tribute to the ideological sophistication of their French counterparts:

> "The greatest tribute we can pay to the French revolutionaries of 1968 is not mindless imitation of their tactics. It is to study their movement carefully, to further our knowledge of the dynamics of the revolutionary process and to take to heart their deep understanding of the dynamics of revolutionary organisation."[17]

However, it was not only the revolutionary consciousness of the student activists in France that was enhanced by the abundance of radical reference points. The revolt also had a far more widespread impact simply because of the presence of those left-wing traditions, which undoubtedly caused the French government to be far more tolerant generally of left wing activities than the American authorities. Obviously, a crucial and primary distinction can be found in the relative strengths and weaknesses of both traditional and extremist left wing groups in each country. Even aside from the main Communist and Socialist Parties in France, there were numerous splinter groups in France of all political persuasions to the left (which were constantly changing) not to mention the extremely powerful labour confederations. Of course, the U.S. had no comparable 'imposing' force of the traditional 'old left' in the vein of the French Communist Party or the Confédération Générale du Travail (C.G.T.). Nor had its extreme left sectarian groups been subject to quite the same factionalism and fragmentation as those in France with their rich and diverse traditions. These traditions permeated all sections of French society, from the intellectual elite to the working class.[18]

For any radical movement in France, there is always the reassuring presence of a strong and influential intellectual left in France. The connection between philosophy and politics has always been important in French society. The intellectual elite has never been on the fringes of French political life; on the contrary, it is an extremely respected group. Names like Sartre and de Beauvoir are household names in France, whilst in the United States, those intellectuals that exist are usually fairly anonymous and exert no political influence whatsoever. French intellectuals have always occupied a place more influential and more critical of the established social order, and hence, in general have been loosely more 'left wing' than American counterparts. As historian Keith Reader has pointed out:

> "The French intellectual is a uniquely prolific and privileged species and the relationship between the intellectual left and the political sphere has long been a characteristic of French society."[19]

This greater prominence of intellectuals in France can be dated back to Rousseau and the ideologues at the time of the Revolution. The Revolution of 1789 could arguably be described as an intellectual as well as political phenomenon and, combined with the centralisation of power around Paris, this has enhanced the influence of the intelligentsia as powerful critics of the French aristocracy, or the 'establishment'.

A comparison of the role that the working class has played in radical politics in each country again illustrates some interesting divergences. In the Sixties movements, there was clearly far more interconnection between students and workers in France than in the United States. France has a major industrial working class which has been organised for left wing activity frequently in the past. This existence of a revolutionary element in the labour movement meant that in France, rather than the United States, the student movement quickly moved out of the university faculty. This was also why, when in the late 1960s, the Belgian marxist economist Ernest Mandel attempted to apply the model of the possibility of the working class creating a revolution in the United States, he was forced to turn for his evidence to the student movement in France. By means of a number of keynote addresses at Socialist Scholars Conferences across the U.S. in 1968 and 1969, he tried to turn American students into a vanguard for the workers, but he simply had no classical precedents in the U.S. to turn to.[20] As for Mandel's student vanguard, aside from one or two ill-fated and poorly organised attempts to integrate some form of organised labour in their struggle, the SDS largely ignored the working classes.[21]

American labour has not in the main been on the left in any classically socialist sense of the term.[22] Its left orientation has always been peripheral and as such, there was no organised labour to which the radical students in the 1960s could appeal. The working classes in the U.S. have been far more compliant as regards their socio-economic role than those in Western Europe. This is why the disadvantaged groups to which the SDS did appeal in the 1960s did not include an economic or industrially based working class. Indeed, if anything, the unionised working class in the United States has tended to turn towards the right of the political spectrum.

As Irving Louis Horowitz has pointed out, it was difficult for the students to work on a doctrine of 'trahison'[23] since:

> "The working class has not been betrayed. It has done much of the betraying....Labour conservatism is not the exclusive hallmark of craft unionism but characterizes proletarian trends as a whole."[24]

Basically, the working class in the United States is wedded to the ideology of American society and its associated consumerism, and has therefore become anti-socialist.[25] The American working class long ago rejected any form of European socialism.[26] Importantly, there has been no common struggle felt strongly enough to unite the proletariat in the U.S., and, as Horowitz concludes:

> "The working class are neither authoritarian nor democratic, but like most Americans, interested in their own economic well-being and devoted to maximising their own portion of the finite pie off which the whole system thrives."[27]

So the prospect of any radical movement in the United States relying upon a working class base as an instrument of social change would necessarily be doomed to failure. Basically, the left in the U.S. was still, by the 1960s, insufficiently strong to build a lasting political movement without coalitions with both the peace forces and the left liberal wing of the Democratic Party. It simply had neither the political experience nor radical traditions necessary to stand alone.

This paucity of radical traditions, and the conservative leanings of the working class in the U.S, should be seen in contrast with the strong, deeply rooted political traditions in France of anarcho-syndicalist and utopian orientation.[28] These clear divergences illustrate the vastly different contextual situations, and the way in which these would affect the philosophical or ideological differences which characterised the 'New Left' radical movements in the 1960s as they existed in each country.

Having set the scene with a discussion of the radical traditions in France and the U.S., we now turn to certain vital questions which need to be addressed regarding the specific contemporary factors which acted as catalysts to the Sixties protest movements. What was it exactly that enabled the Sixties activists to draw on the student population as a whole as recruits for the task of changing society? How was it that the minor protest and pressure groups of the early 1960s could turn into the mass movements which attracted worldwide support by the second half of the decade? What happened in the 1960s has been variously described from a social and cultural revolution of a qualitatively new kind [29], to an infantile rebellion against paternal authority [30]. One thing for certain is that it was a complex interweaving of diverse factors. The remainder of this chapter is an attempt to unravel these complexities, assessing the relative importance of controversial issues such as the education crisis, police repression and, perhaps most important, the Vietnam War.

The discussion of short term issues will begin with the crisis on the university campus. The problems in higher education can be divided into structural issues, which included factors such as overcrowding, centralisation of decision-making and student stress and alienation, and immediate causes, personified particularly in the student strikes and sit-ins at the University of Nanterre.

One of the main structural factors responsible for the education crisis was overcrowding in higher educational institutions. Perhaps one of the most basic, yet critical factors in the campus crises on both sides of the Atlantic was the post-war baby boom. In the United States, according to the U.S. Office of Educational Statistics, the proportion of college age population attending college rose from 22% in 1946 to 45% in 1965. By 1967 there were approximately six million students attending 2,300 colleges and universities across the United States.[31] Similarly, in France there had been a remarkable democratisation of higher education, accompanying the extreme demographic boom of the 1950s and 1960s. Daniel Singer concentrated on the demographic issue in France at some length in Prelude to Revolution, pointing out that after a century of near stagnation, the baby boom created a bulge in the French population which had reached university level by the mid 1960s and was causing severe overcrowding in higher education.[32]

Many commentators substantiate this claim of overcrowding in the universities. The absolute numbers attending university in France had risen from 214,700 in 1960/61 to 805,400 in 1975. Those obtaining the university entrance examination, the baccalauréat had amounted to under 50,000 in 1950. By 1965 this had risen to 97,000 and by 1973 had increased threefold to 150,000.[33] Basically, too many people got into university for the resources and facilities available. As a result lectures were overcrowded, and that with reputedly only 50% of registered students attending. Half the students dropped out after the first year, and a staggering 70% never received a degree.[34] The problems caused by overcrowding in the universities were both purely educational and also employment-related. Many writers have commented on the decline in the quality of educational institutions and poor graduate employment statistics in both France and the U.S. in the 1960s [35], but it is quite clear that such pedagogical issues were far more instrumental in the rise of the French student movement than in the U.S. As Alain Geismar, the leader of the teacher's union SNESup (Syndicat National de l'Enseignement Supérieur) pointed out: "Most of those that do graduate end up unemployed."[36] Similarly, in a 1970 article comparing the academic and employment situation of students in France and the U.S., one of the leading figures in the American New Left, Richard Flacks argued, "It is plausible that the rapid growth in the numbers of educated youth (in France) has produced the same kind of sectional unemployment of the educated which is present in developing nations."[37] Basically, the university system had allowed the number of students to increase at astounding rates, without transforming the system to meet the needs and possibilities of a student population far larger and less certain of its future than those of preceding generations. Geismar expanded on the 'archaic' nature of the French education system in an interview with Hervé Bourges:

> "(The Internal organisation) is completely inadequate in an advanced country with its compartmentalisation of the various disciplines, a hierarchy of disciplines dating from Auguste Comte and of faculty structures inherited from the empire."[38]

Closely connected with the problem of overcrowding was the issue of selection. Selection was a major area of contestation for the student rebels in France because of the use of frequent examinations to whittle down the ever-increasing student population. To the student activists, it seemed pointless to allow so many people into university, only to eject half of them after six or twelve months. The leader of UNEF, (Union des Etudiants Françaises) Jacques Sauvageot, was adamant on the question of examinations: "Our position on examinations is a position of principle and it has always been clear we are against the examination system and we regard it as a means of selection and social segregation."[39]

On the other hand, Richard Flacks in his 1970 article did not consider university overcrowding or employment difficulties to be so vital an issue in the U.S. Working from data on the distribution of student protest on American campuses, Flacks showed that the student movement had its origins at the highest quality state universities and it was only by late 1967 that the dissension spread to schools of lower prestige.[40] Usually, the activists were well off students from upper class backgrounds with promising employment opportunities. In the U.S., New Left activists admitted to their neglect of educational issues, as can be illustrated by an article in New Left Notes in August 1968. "The major difference between Europe and the U.S. is that the European movements are truly mass student movements, with a significant concentration on purely university issues, from exams to course content."[41]

By and large, universities and colleges in the U.S. did not have overcrowding or graduate unemployment problems to the same degree as those in France. As an article in the New Left Notes explained:

> "The reasons for the European emphasis on intra-university and university issues are not hard to discover. The average student leads a more degrading daily life to prepare for a far-less-certain future than his American counterpart."[42]

Autonomy in the university faculties was also a major issue within the campuses of many French and American universities. Demands for autonomy emerged out of a distaste for the 'faceless' centralised bureaucracy which characterised the education system. Again, it must be stressed that this was a far more immediate complaint in the French case. As J.W. Freiberg has contended, the university in France is effectively powerless and even the administration has little or no autonomy: "All decisions of importance are ministerial in origin."[43] The university in France was closely associated and integrated with political power and control. Since Napoleonic times, France has had a centralised education system dominated by the Ministry of Education. Important decisions were always made in Paris and as little initiative as possible was afforded to lower administration levels.[44] As it was organised from governmental offices, any crisis in the university would automatically reverberate in government spheres and spark a national political crisis (as it did in May 1968). However, in the U.S. the colleges were generally administered by a local board of non-elected regents. Hence the universities were generally divorced from short term political conflicts and trends. The result was usually that educational controversies in France became political and not merely organisational issues. A review of the French situation by New Left Notes clarified this crucial divergence:

> "French universities are so tightly controlled by the Ministry of Education that the local university administration has hardly any independent power. So the step from struggling with university administration to struggling with national government was a natural one. It did not have to be mediated by a slow revelation of the role of the university in society (unlike here where it was the complicity of the university in the Cold War and Vietnam which exposed its political role)."[45]

Although centralisation of university decision-making was a bigger issue in France and potentially revolutionary, there was no shortage of anti-bureaucratic polemic directed against the actual university bureaucracy in the United States. Admittedly, this did less to rally most student radicals than more volatile and immediate issues such as the war in Vietnam, but the attacks were still there. One example was the Berkeley Free Speech Movement, which, in the fall of 1964 arose directly out of the increased level of centralisation implemented by the new President of the University of California, Berkeley, Clark Kerr, a point noted by Joseph Paff and Jerry Berman:

> "Despite the theory of decentralisation, the fact is that Kerr has pursued a policy of concentration of power reflected in consistent appointment of weak men to every major subordinate position."[46]

The revolt at Berkeley in 1964/65 was significant in that it was the first occasion in the history of the New Left in the U.S. that student frustrations against university administration had boiled over into actual violent outbursts on the campus. It was sparked off in September over the question of whether student political activities and recruiting for off-campus issues should be allowed on a certain area of the Berkeley campus frequently used for 'soap-box' purposes. On September 15th, this was restricted to 'on campus' issues by the Dean of Students, Katherine Towle, and the Berkeley students responded with petitions, sit-ins and strikes over the following four or five months, led by influential young orators like Mario Savio and Arthur Goldberg. The Berkeley Free Speech Movement has been seen as the "prototype event of the student movement" [47] and the questioning of the right of the university administration to decide upon the level of political activism or dissent permitted was duly noted by radicals on other campuses throughout the U.S.[48] The Free Speech Movement destroyed, in large part, the trust many students had once held in the university as a bastion of social justice. Subsequently university administration was often seen as not only coercive and oppressive, but also hypocritical.

As a result of the extreme centralisation by the university or government administration, students and faculty alike demanded greater autonomy in the decisionmaking process of the university. This desire for a say in the running of the university manifested itself in the U.S. through Carl Davidson's Toward a student syndicalism[49] and in France, in the alliance between UNEF, SNESup and CAL (Comités d'Action

Lycéen). Of course, faculty played a far more decisive role in the student activism in France than in the U.S. Alain Geismar, leader of the teachers' union SNESup, exemplified this greater militancy amongst large numbers of faculty in Paris in a communique on the 17th May speaking for the SNESup:

> "The SNESup calls for all administrative sections to struggle to obtain autonomy in higher education establishments and greater direction towards student-teacher power on an equal basis."[50]

Also, one of the most striking characteristics of the French student movement was the active involvement of young lyc'ee (high school) students in the call for greater student autonomy in education. They distributed at least as many leaflets in the heady days of May as any of the adult extremist groups.[51] The radicalisation of teenagers (whose writings were often the most polemical) goes some way to emphasising the importance of the educational crisis in France, a factor largely and notably absent in the United States.

Related to the questions of autonomy, centralisation and paternalism were the issues of curriculum and, more specifically the 'desire' for greater freedom towards subjectivity in higher education when faced with the prevailing academic style of objectivism. This battle between subjectivism and objectivity, irrationality and reason, were crucial characteristic features of the spirit of the 1960's student movements. A perfect example of this weariness with placidity within universities can be located in the founding document of SDS the 'Port Huron Statement':

> "Neither has our experience in the universities brought us moral enlightenment. Our professors and administrators sacrifice controversy to public relations, their curriculums change more slowly than the living events of the world; their skills and silence are purchased by investors in the arms race; passion is called unscholastic. The questions we might want raised are not thought to be of a 'fruitful nature' and thus are brushed aside." [52]

Student radicals were loathe to be a part of what Edward Shils has called "a repressively tolerant society"[53] in which passivity, objectivity and neutrality ruled peoples lives. In an academic context they argued that it was impossible to have dispassionately-acquired knowledge. Similarly, the student activists in France lamented the conformism of both society and academia, as Jacques Sauvageot explained in an interview with Hervé Bourges in May 1968, "Students are expected to have a certain critical intelligence, while their studies are such that they are not allowed to exercise it".[54]

Another educational factor which laid the groundwork for the student revolts was the extent of the links between the university and government and/or business interests. In the U.S., the connection between academia and technological, corporate society was the multiversity, a term coined by Clark Kerr, President of the University of California, who expounded his views regarding the multiversity in his book The

Uses of the University.[56] He delighted in the idea that American higher education had "become a prime instrument of national purpose" and that it was "at the centre of the knowledge process" that fuelled the national economy.[56] He wanted nothing more than to end the image of fragile ivory towers of earnest but totally impractical scholars wanting only to add to man's knowledge and understanding.

The idea of the multiversity provoked violent polemic from many members of the New Left in the U.S. In a speech entitled "In White America." delivered at a Princeton Conference in February 1967, Greg Calvert, the then President of SDS declared:

> "Students are the trainees for the next working class and the factorylike "Multiversities" are the institutions which prepare them for their slots in the bureaucratic machinery of corporate capitalism. Students are a key group in the creation of the productive forces of this super-technological capitalism."[57]

The student activist seems to have seen himself or herself as a number or minute cog in an unyielding system. As he/she saw it, the university was increasingly becoming a rationalised tool for producing human components for technocratic society, and students (and indeed faculty in many cases) felt they were being placed into positions of decreased personal power. In a university, which was still teaching the classical academic values of critical thought and inquiry, the contradictions were patently clear to them, since in most cases, students and faculty had little opportunity to influence decisionmaking even in the narrow confines of the university, let alone to produce change in the larger context of society. For example, it was usually a detached and anonymous administrative body, rather than faculty or students, that controlled such issues as the choice of courses and where university research was aimed or used.

Similar theories regarding the rise of technocratic society also developed in France.[58] The university bureaucracy was considered by many to be attempting to organise a system of selection among the students to direct them towards a graded hierarchy of specialised technicians to fit them for their role in society. Alain Geismar viewed it as "the installation of a university structure adapted to the short term growth needs of giant firms, able to manufacture middle cadres via the university technology institutes."[59]

Sociologists and student leaders alike had much to say on this theory of the modernisation of capitalism and education's role in it. One particular example came from the strike committee of the Lycée Voltaire in May 1968. "The French University is not separate from the economic and social system. Its structures are modelled on the needs of capitalist, technocratic society."[60] Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the leader of the March 22nd Movement (M22M) characterised technocratic corporate society as: "a pyramid, or more correctly, a complex set of bureaucratic pyramids. As a result, there are not the two poles of Marx, but a whole Jacob's Ladder."[61] Education was viewed therefore as having been rationalised, along with society to train technocrats. Alain Touraine defined technocracy as the concentration of economic decision-making power; "that economic growth determined by the ability to assure technical progress and organise the entire economy."[62] There had been a move away from the individual capitalist to large scale corporations; rationalised organisations which controlled society. Technocracy, for the Sixties activists represented the new ruling class. Hence, the university was naturally attacked for being the willing accomplice of this ruling class.

Of course, there was a factor involved in the U.S. related to the uses of the university which was not so much present in the French case. Often, (as for example, in the case of incidents at Columbia University in New York in April 1968) campus violence was a reaction against the use of the university's research resources for military purposes, a factor which naturally became more controversial as the anti-Vietnam war movement gained momentum. Lawrence Lader pointed out: "The university administration had come to represent a corrupt society....The links between the Pentagon and the University were obvious." Lader went on to claim that the Federal Government paid $246 million to Berkeley to operate three giant atomic installations and $175 million more for 'military connected research'[63]. Just how accurate these statistics are is uncertain, but examples like the Institute for Defence Analysis (IDA) crisis at Columbia University would seem to lend some credence to Mario Savio's assessment of certain universities in the U.S as "factories which turn out certain products needed by industry, government and the military."[64]

Another argument put forward with regard to long term educational problems and activism on the campus was the generational or psychological line adopted by many established sociologists from the Sixties in the U.S. Scholars such as Seymour Lipset and Kenneth Keniston have concentrated on the themes of stress and alienation present in the post-adolescent of the 1960s. Lipset speaks in the introduction to his book Rebellion in the University of "the total rejection of the intolerable world created by their elders. This rejection of the ethic of 'responsibility' has characterised student groups in Japan, France, Germany, the United States and many other countries."[65]

Donald Brown, Professor of Psychology at the University of Michigan, discussed the problems of stress regarding the competitiveness and meritocracy of the modern university, and indeed, of technological post-capitalist society. He pointed out that students were painfully aware of vast contradictions in society. "The hope is for peace, but the harsh reality is war. The hope is for meaning but the immature can see only the hypocritical glitter of Madison Avenue materialism."[66]

Basically, these theorists saw a crisis of depersonalisation in the student generation of the 1960s: youth seeking self-definition, clarity and purpose in life, in a society which deals with large numbers. Edward Shils has summed up the attitude of many liberal and conservative historians and sociologists with regard to youthful idealism and frustration. "All this underscores the discrepancy between the ideal of a regime of plenitude and the "hard facts of life" so often and so rightly referred to by older critics of student radicalism."[67]

Certain right wing writers considered the student unrest in the Sixties as a pathological phenomenon, and hence resorted almost entirely to psychological explanations. A prime example of this approach was employed by Raymond Aron in France, whose theories on the May events centred on a so called "psychodrama" in which the students were consciously acting out roles. He characterised the student revolt as "a nihilism of the aesthetes, or better, the eruption of the barbarians unaware of their barbarity."[68] Where others saw a new form of democratic participation through contestation in public meetings, Aron saw the eclipse of rational discussion and a moral degradation which could only lead to catastrophe. In the U.S. on the other hand, a more patronising approach was usually used, which concentrated on a combination of boredom, confusion, immaturity and alienation.

Although many of these views were valid and constructive to a certain point, most of these writers failed to fully appreciate other possible factors interrelated with these frustrations. If the student riots, particularly in France, but also in the U.S. were merely theatrical outbursts of an entirely psychological dimension, it is difficult to imagine what a real political crisis would be like. Attempts at revolution, race riots and street violence are real political phenomena, whether successful or not, and therefore should be treated as such. Psychological explanations alone fall somewhat short of the mark in presenting a true overall impression of student activism in the Sixties.

To move on at this point from relatively long term structural problems in the university to the immediate causes of the education crisis, it is clear that in the months preceding May in France, education played a crucial role. Student strikes had occurred in opposition to the government proposed Fouchet Plan in November 1967 at the sociology department at Nanterre. Fouchet was the French Minister of Education responsible for these reforms which were intended to divide higher education into several cycles. As well as providing the usual four year degree, the University would also provide a second-rate degree after two years, preparing students for junior jobs in teaching, industry and/or government. This idea of a cheapened degree plus the proposal to abolish free university admission outraged students. All or at least most attacks by every group in the movement on education reserved a few harsh words for the Fouchet Plan.

The short term source of the educational crisis in the late 1960s can be traced back to the government's 'Wonder University' Nanterre, in the seventeenth arrondissement of Paris. As early as Autumn 1965 ("Red Autumn")[69] Nanterre experienced three months of scuffles and demonstrations after police were called in to break up a 1700-strong student protest against the building of a warden's lodge in front of the female residence at Antony. In the spring of 1967, a similar "bedroom revolt" erupted at Nanterre, when the 'boys' in residence invaded the corridors of the 'girls'' dormitories, breaking a rule set by the government administration in Paris that had prevented males from entering female dorms.[70] Finally, the months from November 1967 to April 1968 saw the widespread development at Nanterre of a combination of student strikes, sit-ins and demonstrations, mainly centred around the sociology department. The sociology students at Nanterre took exception to the paternalistic attitude of the administration and undertook, as Daniel Cohn-Bendit wrote six months later "an intensified attack on monastic university regulations and particularly on the prudish intervention in the personal affairs of students living in the university."[71]

Much has already been written questioning the wisdom of the siting of the Nanterre campus,[72] so it will suffice here to point to the students' argument, which highlighted the ways in which the problems at Nanterre personified the shortcomings of the Fouchet Plan. In the report of the first Sorbonne General Assembly on the 19th May, the student radicals argued:

> "It is easy to understand why the movement took shape at Nanterre, in a faculty lacking the ancestral elements of the Sorbonne and dedicated almost entirely to the application of Fouchet's new reform."[73]

Clearly therefore, the education crisis played a vital role in provoking thousands of students into campus activism. Undoubtedly, the students' educational grievances and the various conflicts with authority and hierarchy on the campus arena, naturally led them to a more general questioning of the authoritarian nature of the political and economic establishment. In France, this was personified in the imposing figure of General de Gaulle, whilst in the United States, although much of the antiwar protest was directed at Lyndon Johnson, it would be more accurate to define the movement as an attack on the post war development of 'corporate liberalism'.

The attack on Gaullism in France can be related to the dislike for the educational administration. Both were seen as representatives of a distant and faceless authority. Basically, France was burdened with a centralised, profoundly hierarchical government bureaucracy. Gaullism reflected a paternalism of modern French society which was totally out of touch with the explosive spirit of the times.[74] Virtually all decisions were made in Paris. As Alain Touraine wrote in 1971:

> "For most workers and students, especially the young, Gaullism was a monarchical system incapable of recognising the problems of the French people, who interested it less than French Grandeur.....for all or almost all on the left, the overthrow of Gaullism was the most immediate objective."[75]

It does appear from a reading of the bulk of leaflets distributed in May and June 1968, that the one common issue on which all could agree, from the most extreme Trotskyist and Maoist groups to the more moderate student unions (UNEF and UEC)[76], was that ten years of Gaullism was quite enough. French hierarchical structures had been tightened rather than relaxed by de Gaulle, and as a result, responsibility and decision-making power had been vested in a relatively few people at the top of the pyramid.

The Sixties movement in the United States was essentially based on the ideals of individual liberty, a principle central to the founding document of the nation, the Declaration of Independence. This classical liberalism, by the second half of the twentieth century, seemed to have evolved into one based more on organisation on an impersonal, larger, and less manageable scale than individualism. Although corporate liberalism was not in theory as authoritarian as Gaullism, it was felt by most of the student radicals that recent governments had been failing to institute those constitutional ideals based on liberty. These were, after all, principles which were supposed to be inherent in the American Constitution. The critique of corporate liberalism went through certain stages, each one more hostile than the last. The "Agenda for a New Generation" Port Huron Statement in 1962 had advocated alliances with various liberal institutions, but by the time "America and New Era" was brought out by SDS in June 1963, faith in liberalism in its American form was beginning to dwindle:

> "In power for a generation, liberalism has adopted a neutral managerial role....Organised liberalism must take at least part of the credit for America's political stalemate."[77]

1965 saw SDS President Carl Oglesby's famous "Trapped in a system" speech at a Washington D.C. antiwar demonstration, in which he embarked upon an open indictment of corporate liberalism. The war undoubtedly did much to foster this impatience, as Oglesby talked of "illiberal liberalism" which "said to the poor and the dispossessed: What we acquire of your resources, we repay in civilisation. The white man's burden."[78] However, by 1966, in the eyes of most student radicals, liberalism had lost any synonymity with democracy it had once held. An article in the New Republic by Richard Flacks exemplified this mood:

> "In both its rhetoric and in practice, liberal corporativism implies a political structure in which

> principal policy issues are worked out at the Federal level, formulated with the active participation of experts, and ratified, not in the legislative arena, but through a process of consultation among a national elite representing those interests and institutions which now recognise each other as legitimate."[79]

Related to this rejection of the "Establishment" was perhaps one of the most direct reasons for the rallying of greater numbers to the student cause: police and state repression. Whether or not the response by the authorities was anticipated by the extremist revolutionaries has been a source of major debate, not least amongst the revolutionaries themselves,[80] but what is certain is that it had a catalytic effect on the scope of the student movements on both sides of the Atlantic. As French political theorist, Hervé Hamon has commented:

> "Hesitant and contradictory, unable to repress thoroughly, yet not quick witted enough to offer the right concessions early in the game, the Gaullist government was strangely reminiscent of its July Monarchy predecessors on the eve of 1848. Its ineptitude helped create a movement that might well never have materialised otherwise."[81]

The spontaneous nature of the student revolts was often a direct consequence of mishandling of a certain situation by the police and authorities. As John Gretton has pointed out regarding May in Paris: "All eyewitness accounts confirm the spontaneous character of the student riot and many photographs were taken showing students with books and satchels in one hand a cobblestone in the other."[82]

In many cases, the influence of the demonstrators was spread, not so much by their own proposals or deeds but by the administrative bodies calling in the police. Alain Geismar, the leader of the teachers union SNESup and one of the main spokesmen for the students in Paris in May, called it "reflex solidarity."[83] Of course, once this point became quite clear, the revolutionaries made the most of the situation. In a leaflet distributed on the 13th May by the M22M, students and workers were told:

> "War on repression is war against the police state and capitalist exploitation. Cops are only de Gaulle's domestic servants and de Gaulle is only the domestic servant of the bourgeoisie....Down with the police state. Down with capitalism! Workers and students, fight for socialism in the streets!"[84]

A revolutionary committee was set up with the sole task of dealing with police repression and brutality, "La Comité de défense contre la Répression". It was instituted primarily as a response to the arrest of student leaders, the occupation of the Sorbonne by the police and the disciplinary action taken by the education administration against certain student agitators. These complaints, and more, were outlined by the leader of SNESup, Alain Geismar at a Press Conference on the 12th May.[85] In the U.S., the situation was not much different. The violent tactics which had been used by the authorities in the southern states to quell civil rights activists in the early 1960s (experienced at first hand by many early SDS leaders) was easily translated to the arenas of Columbia University in April 1968, and the Chicago Democratic Convention in August the same year. David Bouchier, in his book Idealism and Revolution pointed out that examples such as FBI surveillance, the House Un-American Activities Committee[86], and J. Edgar Hoover actually "made the protestors feel revolutionary."[87]

We move finally in this chapter to probably the most important single issue in rallying the average student behind the movement, the Vietnam War. If one were to take a sample of the writings of New Left activists in the 1960s, whether in France or the U.S., the dominant feature would undoubtedly be the war in Southeast Asia. Although, as one would expect, the war had its most direct impact in the United States in the form of issues like the draft, it is clear from the contemporary reports that the language employed in France regarding America's role in Vietnam was at least as polemical as that in the U.S. It is quite likely that as much was written in France on the subject as in the U.S.[88] Problems do arise regarding the precise emphasis of the arguments directed against U.S. involvement in Vietnam, but it seems from much of the literature that the French extremists, and particularly the young Trotskyists, developed historically, ideologically-based arguments in favour of Third World nationalism and revolution and against U.S. imperialism. This was in marked contrast to the radicals in the United States, who based their opposition to the war not only on its immediacy in the form of the draft and reports of war casualties, but also on morality and conscience.

For the American student movement, the war was vital. Vietnam was an extremely powerful rallying force in the U.S. By the year of the anti-war demonstrations, 1967, the phrase was coined: 'the streets belong to the people'. Indeed, on April 15th of that year, between 350,000 and 500,000 people demonstrated at various anti-war rallies across the nation.[89] In terms of membership, the peak of success for the SDS came in 1967 and 1968 with the war as the major rallying issue. Massimo Teodori, editor of an anthology of the American New Left, commented:

> "The war introduced into American domestic policy, elements of crisis and change in the political framework which perhaps no 'ordinary' event could ever have provoked. In 1964, the New Left groups were weak, isolated and issue oriented, with an approach that still left room for agreement with liberal forces. By 1968, even though without definite orientation, internal cohesion and strategic unity, the radical movement had characteristics of a mass movement."[90]

As early as 1965, the then President of the SDS, Paul Potter, made the point quite clearly that Vietnam had to be the overriding issue for the New Left to unify the SDS. In a speech delivered at an anti-war demonstration he contended:

> "If the people of this country are to end the war in Vietnam and to change the institutions which create it,

> the people of this country must create a massive social movement - and if that can be built around the issue of Vietnam, then that is what we must do."[91]

The war issue in the U.S was naturally based much more on personal considerations than in France, owing to its immediacy. Although this was to change by 1968, when anti-imperialist complaints became more explicit, (under the influence of the Progressive Labour Party), Americans generally had less of an ideological or indeed international perspective on the issue than the French activists. As reports of war dead began to escalate along with American involvement, for many, opposition to the war became a very personal issue. Similarly, by 1966, another very direct personal threat was posed, when in February the draft exemption was lifted. By 1967 there were Draft Resistance Committees springing up all across the country, organised mainly by the Student Mobilisation Committee.[92] Earlier statements by the extreme Maoist, anti-imperialist group, the May 2nd Movement (M2M) in Spring 1964 such as the "We won't go" pamphlet[93] were being carried out literally on a nationwide scale. The M2M brought out another anti-draft leaflet in April 1967 entitled "We refuse to serve" which defined its intentions quite clearly:

> "The Resistance is a nationwide movement with organisations in New York, Illinois, Massachusetts, Iowa, Ohio, Wisconsin, Michigan, Oregon and California.... We will clearly challenge the government's right to use any young lives for its own nefarious purposes."[94]

Questioning the war often developed into a general confusion regarding not only America's role on a global scale, but also its own political system and democratic values, as this speech delivered by SDS National Secretary, Paul Potter indicates:

> "What kind of system is it that justifies the U.S. or any other country seizing the destinies of the Vietnamese people and using them callously for their own purpose? What kind of system is it that leaves millions of people throughout the country impoverished and excluded from the mainstream of American society, that creates faceless and terrible bureaucracies and makes those the places where people spend their lives and do their work, that consistently puts material values before human values -- and still persists in calling itself free and still persists in finding itself fit to police the world? We must change that system."[95]

It would probably not be an exaggeration to say that the war in Vietnam provided the 'cutting edge' for many radicals to sever the illusion that principles of morality and democracy guided American foreign policy. Hence, objections to the United States' role in the war had begun to evolve into criticisms based on morality and conscience. An example of this can be seen in the aforementioned Paul Potter speech at the Washington march on April 17th 1965:

> "The saccharine, self-righteous moralism that promises the Vietnamese a billion dollars of economic aid at the very moment we are delivering billions of economic and social destruction and political repression is rapidly losing what power it might ever have had to reassure us about the decency of our foreign policy."[96]

Very little was written by members of SDS on the merits or otherwise of Third World nationalism. One exception in 1966 was an article in New Left Notes entitled "the United States and the Third World" which argued:

> "The Cold War is deeply embedded in our culture. America misunderstands the turbulence in the underdeveloped world by interpreting it as the product of the struggle between east and west blocs. The emotions on which insurgencies in the Third World draw are genuine and intense - they come from the demands for national integrity and for relief from poverty."[97]

Even here, there is no explicit call for Third World revolution and the emphasis tends to be placed upon the immoral role of the U.S. Anti-imperialist sentiment and writing in the U.S. seems to have experienced evolutionary changes through the Sixties. Although in the early years of the American intervention, criticism tended to be restricted to the single issue of the war itself, by 1966 and after, an explicit and intricately developed anti-imperialist critique began to emerge. This probably had much to do with the increasing influence of the Maoist Progressive Labour Party (PL) within SDS, which had sharply defined anti-imperialist arguments against the war developed from Leninism. The PL's arguments were based on the claim that the U.S. wanted to build a new sphere of neocolonialism in an area of rich natural resources left by France. The impact of Progressive Labour's anti-imperialist ideology on New Left thinking can be seen in SDS President Carl Oglesby's impressions on the kind of 'peace' the United States government had in mind, from New Left Notes:

> "We (the United States as a whole) want a peace in which the world will be safe for the American businessman to do his doings everywhere, on terms always advantageous, in environments always protected by friendly or puppet oligarchies.....We want a world integrated in terms of the stability of labour, resources, production and markets, and we want that integrated world to be managed by our own business people. The United States that is, is an imperialist power."[98]

French radical opposition to the Vietnam war was quite different from that in the United States. Indochina had been an integral and vital part of France's colonial Empire since the nineteenth century and it had only been in the 1950s that French troops finally withdrew from Southeast Asia. It seems difficult to believe however that this factor could incite the various French left wing groups to attack American involvement in Vietnam so passionately, vociferously, and indeed prolifically. There were various movements created in France in opposition to the Vietnam War, the most outspoken being the Comité Vietnam National (CVN)(dominated by the Trotskyist Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire). Nor were these groups formed as an attempt to enhance the May riots. They had been in existence a long time before then. CVN had called a demonstration in November 1967 which had been attended by a quite staggering 70,000 people.[99] Indeed, even as far back as July 4th 1966 a protest march in Paris had attracted a thousand French participants alongside the six hundred

Americans.[100] As well as attracting wide support, another anti-Vietnam movement, the *Comité Vietnam de Base* (controlled by the Maoist *Union des Jeunesse Communistes(marxiste-leniniste)*) distributed a weekly review entitled *Le Courrier du Vietnam* which kept those interested in France up to date with the progress of the Vietcong.[101]

It could in fact be argued that the CVN was ultimately responsible in March 1968 for the creation of the March 22nd Movement (M22M), and hence indirectly the student upheavals in Paris in early May. On the 18th and 20th March, two Vietnam inspired bombings were carried out on American targets in Paris by young *lycée* students associated with the CVN. The targets were the Bank of America, the Chase Manhatten Bank and the offices of the TWA and American Express. Two days later, the police arrested five members of the CVN in connection with the bombings, prompting a sit-in of sociology students in the administrative offices of the University of Paris, Nanterre. At that demonstration, the M22M was created, the organisation which proved to be the most influential in the Paris revolt. Alain Touraine qualifies this point however, explaining that "these actions were the doing of small activist or ideological groups, whose methods were not designed to attract the participation of the students."[102] Indeed, when asked in interview about the importance in the student revolt of Vietnam and the Vietnam Committees, Jacques Sauvageot replied that it was very important in the thinking of the revolutionary hard core, "but not, I think in the student milieu."[103]

What were the motives of these French extremists in their stance on the war in Indochina? Obviously they had little in common with the immediate expediency which lay behind the American polemics. Much of the writing seems to have been paying lip service to the cause of the Vietnamese people, rather than dealing with important questions in depth. Most of it was repetitive and in the style of slogans[104] as if supporting the Vietnamese revolutionaries was the 'in thing' to do. Calls like: "In France, we must enhance the traditions of solidarity between French and Vietnamese workers" seemed devoid of any real significance.[105]

It becomes apparent from a reading of much of the antiwar literature in France, that the main theme was not only a condemnation of the war and American involvement in Vietnam, but also incorporated the ideas of Third World nationalism, self-determination and revolution. This goes some way to explaining why Vietnam was such a fascinating issue for French radicals and left wing intellectuals. Left wing thinkers in France like Jean-Paul Sartre and Regis Debray had become deeply disillusioned by communism in its Russian 'orthodox' form. The Stalinist years had cast a huge shadow over the dream of socialists and communists in the western democracies. As a result of this disillusionment, many radical intellectuals in France had begun to believe that the only remaining hope for ideal communist revolution lay in the poorer countries of the struggling Third World, such as Cuba and Vietnam. In their nationalist struggles against capitalist and post-capitalist investment, there seemed to lay the possibility for the emergence of a purer form of left-oriented government.[106] Naturally enough, this was not a major issue in the minds of most American activists. In fact, France was an exceptional case when compared with other social democratic countries on this question. Thanks mainly to de Gaulle's dislike for the U.S. and his criticism of American moves, not only into Indochina but also South America, France had far fewer ties with American intervention in the Third World than most other western democracies. Hence it had a far freer hand as regards supporting the liberation of the people of the Third World.

The Troskyist groupuscule, Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire (JCR) was particularly active in the CVN during 1967 and 1968. This was the one Trotskyist group in France which advocated the possibility of Marxist-Leninist style revolution in the Third World. Not only did it support the armed struggle against 'American imperialism' but also justified the programme of the Vietnamese Communist Party as an empirical revolutionary party. As a report by the JCR controlled Comité Tiers-Monde contended: "It must no longer be a question of 'aid' to the Third World. It must now be a question of international revolution." [107]

The JCR did not however hold a monopoly on this issue in France. Various groups claimed an affinity with such idols as Che Guevara, Fidel Castro, Ho Chi Minh and Vo Nguyen Giap, and their guerrilla struggles for national self-determination. One such group was the Comité National d'Action, here calling for the liberation of the Third World from western economic domination:

> "To support the heroic struggle of the Vietnamese people and contribute to their final victory, so that they may direct their own destiny in freedom, independence and peace, the CNA calls all those who are on the side of the Vietnamese people against American aggression;"[108]

On the whole, it is clear that, (naturally enough!) the American radicals either opposed the war in Vietnam for personal or expedient reasons, or out of a sense of moral outrage at the horrors taking place at the hands of 'democracy'. In France, although the war was a less immediate issue, student activists and extremists tended to take more of an ideological stance against what was considered an 'international' issue.

An attempt has been made in this chapter to both place the Sixties student radical movements into historical context, (based on an overview of the radical political traditions in France and the United States), and to assess the specific factors in the 1960s which precipitated the rise of these movements. In France, it seems that student discontent with the many contradictions within the French education system had been simmering beneath the surface for some time, and all that was needed was the necessary spark. This trigger came between March and May 1968, a combination of extremist anti-Vietnam war violence, the immediate educational problems apparent at Nanterre and the mishandling of a delicate situation by the education administration, central government and the police authorities. The suddenness and extremity of the May riots in Paris should be viewed in the context of a long history of radical and revolutionary activity dating back to the French Revolution and an organised working class that has frequently been mobilised for radical action in the past.

In the United States, it is likely that without the anti-war movement which gained momentum between March 1965 and June 1868, there would have been no mass student movement in the Sixties. Although many other smaller issues played their role in the radicalising of the student population, such as the campus revolts, the civil rights movement and the questioning of the virtues of corporate liberalism, the Students for a Democratic Society needed the war in Vietnam to unite all its different strands under the one banner. Only a direct issue which affected the lives of millions of Americans could elevate a radical movement in the U.S. above mere marginal pressure group status. To be sure, radicalism is not intrinsic in American society.

In chapter two the discussion turns to the ideological influences on, and characteristics of the "original" New Left in France and the United States, as it existed before the infiltration of the "old left" Trotskyists and Maoist splinter groups caused severe factionalism and internal confusion.

ENDNOTES TO CHAPTER ONE

1. See C. Tilly, The Contentious French (Massachusetts; Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1986) p.309. Also, E. Diexel Godfrey, The Government of France (N.Y; Thomas Crowell Co, 1962) pp.5-8 & pp.22-23, and Jean Blondel, The Government of France (N.Y; Thomas Crowell Co, 1974) p.46.

2. The stanadard text for this is René Remond, The Right in France (Paris; Seuil, 1967). See also Donald J. Harvey, France since the Revolution (N.Y; Free Press, 1968) p.2.

3. For the place of radicalism in French political life, see Douglas Johnson, "The historical debate on the two Frances" in Vincent Wright, Conflict and Consensus in France (London; Frank Cass & Co, 1979) pp.3-10. Also Patrick Hutton, The Cult of the Revolutionary Tradition: the Blanquists in French Politics (Berkeley; University of California Press, 1981) pp.3-16.

4. J. Blondel, The Government of France pp.46-50.

5. A. Touraine, The May Movement. Revolt and Reform. May 1968. The Student Rebellion and Workers' Strikes. The Birth of a Social Movement (N.Y. Random House, 1971) p.20.

6. Ehud Zelig Sprinzak, "Democracy and Illegitimacy: A Study of the American and French Student Movements and some Theoretical Implications" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1971) p.127.

7. For examples of repression by state police, vigilantes and police officials in the early twentieth century see M. Cantor, The Divided Left: American Radicalism, 1900-1975 (N.Y. Hill & Wang, 1978) pp.38-9. For the repression carried out during the McCarthy years see Cantor, pp.62-3 & p.78.

8. See M. Cantor, The Divided Left p.172.

9. J. Miller, Democracy is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago (N.Y. Simon & Schuster, 1987) pp.136-7. Also see M. Cantor, The Divided Left pp.180-1.

10. See M. Harrington, Decade of Decision: The Crisis of the American System (N.Y. Simon & Schuster, 1980).

11. See J. Miller, Democracy is in the Streets pp.162 & 322 Also M. Cantor, The Divided Left pp.196-7 & 201-3.

12. For this interpretation, see the prologue to A. Priaulx & S.J. Ungar, The Almost Revolution: France 1968 (N.Y. Dell Publishing Co Inc, 1969) p.1. Also, B.E. Brown, Protest in Paris: Anatomy of a Revolt (N.J. General Learning Press, 1974) pp.84-5.

13. See Irving Louis Horowitz, The Struggle is the Message. The Organisation and Ideology of the Anti-war Movement (Berkeley; Glendessary Press, 1970) p.89.

14. I.L. Horowitz, The Struggle is the Message pp.94-101.

15. Taken from an article in New Left Notes, June 23rd, 1968 p.3.

16. Declaration by the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire on May 21st 1968. Cited in V. Fisera (ed), Writing on the Wall. France May 1968: A Documentary Anthology (N.Y. St Martin's Press, 1978) p.151.

17. Article in New Left Notes, July 15th, 1968 p.2.

18. For working class radicalism, see A. Touraine, The May Movement p.18-9. For the radical influences among intellectuals, see K. Reader, Intellectuals and the Left in France (N.Y. St Martins Press, 1987) pp. 3-5.

19. K. Reader, Intellectuals and the Left in France p.4.

20. See E. Mandel, "The Lessons of May 1968: The Commune Lives," published in New Left Review No 52, Nov-Dec 1968. Also see a later work by Mandel entitled The Revolutionary Potential of the Working Class (N.Y. Pathfinder, 1974) Although in 1968, Mandel was allowed into the U.S. to deliver his speeches, a year later in 1969 the Nixon administration barred him from entering the U.S., so his address had to be tape recorded.

21. M. Cantor, The Divided Left pp.185 & 204. For the SDS neglect of the working class, see also an article by C. Clark Kissinger (graduate of the University of Wisconsin and associate editor of Studies on the Left) entitled, "The Bruns Strike: A case study in student participation in Labour" first distributed as an SDS working paper in October 1963 and included in Cohen and Hale, The New Student Left: An Anthology (Boston; Beacon, 1966) pp.114-5.

22. I.L. Horowitz, Ideology and Utopia in the U.S. 1956-1976 (Berkeley; Glendessary Press, 1980) pp.99 & 107. Also see M. Cantor, The Divided Left p.6.

23. Translation, 'betrayal'.

24. Irving Louis Horowitz, Ideology and Utopia in the U.S. 1956-1976 p.99.

25. M. Cantor, The Divided Left p.6. Also see I.L. Horowitz, Ideology and Utopia in the U.S. p.102.

26. M. Cantor, The Divided Left p.52 & pp.101-2.

27. I.L. Horowitz, Ideology and Utopia in the U.S p.106.

28. For the French traditions see D. Singer, Prelude to Revolution: France in May 1968 (N.Y. Hill & Wang,1970) pp.58 & 359 & J. Ehrenreich, Long March, Short Spring (N.Y. Monthly Review Press, 1969) p.77. For the paucity of traditions in the U.S. and the conservative nature of the working classes see E. Mandel & D. Novack, The Revolutionary Potential of the Working Classes, I.L. Horowitz, Ideology and Utopia in the U.S & M. Cantor, The Divided Left.

29. Alain Touraine's "The May Movement, Revolt and Reform, May 1968. The Student Rebellion and Workers' Strikes. The Birth of a Social Movement." (N.Y. Random House 1971).

30. Raymond Aron "The Elusive Revolution: Anatomy of a Student Revolt" (N.Y. Praeger Publishers 1969).

31. Richard E. Peterson "Student Left in American Higher Education" from S. M. Lipset and P. Altbach (ed) "Students in Revolt" pp.210-11 (Peterson was quoting from the U.S. office of Education Digest of Educational Statistics 1966).

32. See Daniel Singer, Prelude to Revolution (N.Y. Hill and Wang, 1970) p.44.

33. D.L. Hanley & A.P. Kerr, May '68 p.42.

34. Alain Geismar in The French Student Revolt: The Leaders Speak (London, Cape: 1968) p.29. These figures can also be found in Bernard E. Brown, Protest in Paris: Anatomy of a Revolt (New Jersey, General Learning Press; 1874) p.130.

35. See for example D.L. Hanley & A.P. Kerr, Contemporary France: Politics and Society since 1945 (London; Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984) For other comments on the university entrance examination, see John Gretton, Students and Workers p.50, Priaulx and Ungar, The Almost Revolution p.18 and Seale and McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag p.18.

36. Geismar p.29.

37. R. Flacks "Social and cultural meanings of student revolt" from Sampson & Korn, Student Activism and Protest p.125.

38. Geismar p.30.

39. Jacques Sauvageot in The French Student Revolt: The Leaders Speak p.67.

40. Richard Flacks "Social and cultural meanings of student revolt" from E. Sampson and D. Korn, Student Activism and Protest (San Francisco; Jossey-Bass, 1970) p.125.

41. "European Students" in New Left Notes August 12, 1968 p.7.

42. "European Students: Part III France" from New Left Notes July 8th, 1968 p.8.

43. J. W. Freiberg from the Introduction to Alain Touraine's The May Movement: Revolt and Reform, May 1968 p.15.

44. D.L. Hanley and A.P. Kerr, Contemporary France: Politics and Society since 1945 p.107.

45. "European Students..." from New Left Notes July 8, 1968; p.9.

46. Joseph Paff, Bill Cavala and Jerry Berman. "The student riots at Berkeley and dissent in the Multiversity." An article which first appeared in the January 1965 issue of The Activist quoted in M. Cohen and D. Hale, The New Student Left: An Anthology (Boston, Beacon; 1966) p.248.

47. S.M. Lipset, Rebellion in the University (Boston; Little, Brown & Co, 1972) p.xix.

48. See M. Cantor, The Divided Left p.184.

49. This can be found in the New Left Notes dated September 9, 1966, pp.2 and 111. Basically it was a call by the General Secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society at the time, Carl Davidson, for an attempt at greater autonomy by encouraging the various SDS chapters across the country's universities to take control of their student's unions.

50. A. Geismar from Communiqué du SNESup: Vendredi 17 Mai (transl. from the French).

51. See R. Fraser, 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt (N.Y. Pantheon Books, 1988) p.221. The "Tracts de Mai" collection of leaflets from the student revolt includes hundreds by the Comités d'Action Lycéen. For one particular example, see V. Fisera, Writing on the Wall. France May 1968: A Documentary Anthology p.254.

52. From the "Port Huron Statement" (June 1962) in M. Teodori, The New Left: A Documentary History (New York, Bobbs Merril; 1969) p.165.

53. Edward Shils "Dreams of Plenitude, Nightmares of Scarcity" from S. M. Lipset and P. Altbach (ed), Students in Revolt p.17.

54. Jacques Sauvageot, from The French Student Revolt: The Leaders Speak pp.11-12.

55. Clark Kerr, The Uses of the University (Massachusetts; Harvard University Press, 1963) pp.8-9.

56. Kerr, The Uses of the University pp.viii, 19, 49 & pp. 114-8.

57. Greg Calvert. A speech delivered at the Princeton Conference, February 1967 entitled "In White America, Radical Consciousness and Social Change" from M. Teodori. The New Left: A Documentary History p.417.

58. For the major criticisms of technocratic society in France, see A. Touraine, The May Movement.

59. A. Geismar in The French Student Revolt: The Leaders Speak p.30.

60. From a report by Le Comité de Grève du Lycée Voltaire May 1968. (transl. from the French).

61. Daniel Cohn Bendit, Obsolete Communism: The Left Wing Alternative p.108.

62. Alain Touraine, The May Movement p.29.

63. These statistics and the previous quotation from L. Lader Power on the Left. American Radical Movements Since 1946 (New York, W. W. Norton; 1979) p.180.

64. Mario Savio, "An End to History" from S. M. Lipset and S. Wolin (ed). The Berkeley Student Revolt (New York, Garden City, 1965) pp.216-219.

65. Seymour M. Lipset, Rebellion in the University (Boston, Little, Brown and Co; 1971) p.4.

66. Donald R. Brown "Student Activism and Developmental Stress" from E. Sampson and D. Korn Student Activism and Protest p.93.

67. Edward Shils "Dreams of Plenitude, Nightmares of Scarcity" from S. M. Lipset and P. Altbach (ed), Students in Revolt p.22.

68. For Aron's opinions on the 'psychodrama' see R. Aron The Elusive Revolution: Anatomy of a Student Revolt (New York, Praeger, 1969) p33-7. For the digression to barbarism see p.15.

69. The expression "Red Autumn" comes from P. Seale & M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag p.25.

70. Seale & McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag p.25.

71. Daniel Cohn Bendit, Obsolete Communism: The Left Wing Alternative (London; Deutsch, 1968) p.29.

72. Literature addressing the siting of the Nanterre campus includes John Gretton, Students and Workers p.76, V. Fisera, Writing on the Wall p.18, Seale and McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag pp.20-3 and A. Touraine, The May Movement pp.122-6.

73. L'Assemblée Générale de la Sorbonne (translated from the French) May 19, 1968 p.2.

74. See P. Seale & M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag p.93.

75. A. Touraine, The May Movement p.227-8.

76. UEC(F) was an alternative national students union to UNEF. The Union des Etudiants Communistes (de France) was effectively under the control of the French Communist Party (PCF) and as such was loyal to the form of communism which characterised the Soviet Union. It will be seen later, that this opposition to Gaullism was virtually the only issue that all of the splinter groups on the left could agree on.

77. Taken from "America and New Era" an SDS document written in June 1963 from M. Teodori The New Left: A Documentary History p.180.

78. Carl Oglesby, "Trapped in a System", October 27, 1965 from Teodori "The New Left: A Documentary History p.186.

79. Richard Flacks, "Is the Great Society Just a Barbecue?" from The New Republic January 29, 1966, p.18.

80. For examples of this, see P. Seale and M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag pp.16-17 or Richard Johnson, The French Communist Party versus the Students: Revolutionary Politics

in May-June 1968 (New Haven; Yale University Press, 1972) pp.168-9.

81. D.L. Hanley & A.P. Kerr, May '68 (London; Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987) p.5.

82. See John Gretton Students and Workers (London, Macdonald: 1969) p.83. For the photographs appropriate to this quotation see those dated 3 May in Philippe Labro "Les Barricades de Mai (Paris, Solar, 1968) no page numbers.

83. Alain Geismar from The French Student Revolt p.32.

84. Leaflet or 'tract' distributed by the March 22nd Movement on 13th May 1968 calling people to the major demonstration on General Strike day, at the Gare de L'Est. No title (transl. from the French).

85. Declaration faite par A. Geismar "Conférence de Presse 12 Mai 1968 - 2H 15".

86. HUAC or "House Un-American Activities Committee" was active throughout the 1950s and 1960s, and was basically a vehicle for the authorities to interrogate those people considered to have connections with Communist groups.

87. David Bouchier Idealism and Revolution: New Ideologies of Liberation in Britain and the United States (London; Edward Arnold; 1978) p.74.

88. To get a clear idea of the mass of literature written by French student activists on Vietnam in the form of leaflets and pamphlets in the late 1960s, see the Tracts de Mai collection from the Bibliothèque Nationale de Zurich on microfiche at the University of California, Berkeley.

89. L. Lader Power on the Left p.228.

90. M. Teodori The New Left: A Documentary History p.58.

91. This question by Paul Potter was from a speech delivered at a Washington DC anti-war demonstration on April 17th 1965, entitled "The Incredible War". It was written up in full in the National Guardian, April 29th 1965.

92. The Student Mobilisation Committee To End the War in Vietnam (S.M.C) was a Trotskyist controlled antiwar group under the influence of the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) and its young affiliate, Young Socialist Alliance (YSA). It was one of the main means by which the Trotskyists gained in influence towards the end of the Sixties, since here they had found a central theme around which all radicals could gather.

93. "We won't go" statement signed by about 500 people in May 1964. It began, "We, the undersigned are young Americans of Draft age. We understand our obligations to defend our country and to serve in the armed forces, but we object to being asked to support the war in Vietnam....Believing that we should not be asked to fight against the people of Vietnam we herewith state our refusal to do so."

94. The "We refuse to serve" statement was distributed in April 1967, and it stated a clear position of noncooperation, open confrontation with the military authorities and mutual solidarity among the resisters.

95. From Paul Potter's speech at the Washington anti-war rally on April 17th 1965 entitled "The Incredible War." Written up in the National Guardian on April 29th.

96. Extract from Paul Potter's speech published in the National Guardian, April 29th 1965.

97. Article entitled "United States and the Third World" from a series in New Left Notes, "Crisis of Cold War Ideology", written by Carl Oglesby, July 29, 1966. p.3.

98. Carl Oglesby, "American Intervention in the Third World" in New Left Notes August 24, 1966, p.4.

99. Figure taken from a C.V.N. leaflet dated January 22nd 1968 and entitled Pour la victoire du peuple Vietnamien (transl. from the French).

100. See "July 4th - Paris" from New Left Notes July 22, 1966, p.2.

101. From a leaflet dated February 1968 distributed by the Comité Vietnam de base entitled Pourquoi lire le courrier du Vietnam?

102. A. Touraine, The May Movement p.137.

103. Jacques Sauvageot from The French Student Revolt: The Leaders Speak p.13.

104. Most of the CVN, CVB and Comité Tiers Monde leaflets were identical in content with standard slogans seemingly lacking any depth. Examples of this can be seen in Vladimir Fisera's Writing on the Wall p.62, when he takes extracts from the Maoist journal Garde Rouge.

105. Taken from a CVN leaflet entitled "Salute the glorious Vietnamese Workers". n.d.

106. Alain Touraine calls it the "utopian dream" of Third World nationalism. Touraine, The May Movement p.25, p.336 & p.345. See also Regis Debray's article originally published in Les Temps Modernes entitled "Castroism: The Long March in Latin America" in which he expounded his views on Third World nationalism and revolution. It can also be found in R. Debray, Strategy for Revolution (London; Johnathan Cape, 1967).

107. Resolution 12 from a report by the Comité Tiers-Monde dated approximately February 1968 (transl. from the French).

108. This quotation is taken from a leaflet distributed on the 13th February 1968 by the CNA entitled "Manifestation pour le peuple Vietnamien" (Transl. from the French).

CHAPTER TWO

This chapter examines the early ideological influences on and characteristics of the new student left as expressed in the actions and writings of the leaders of the March 22nd Movement in France and the Students for a Democratic Society in the U.S. In particular, it points to the early idealism and spontaneity apparent in the movements on both sides of the Atlantic. The chapter begins with an assertion that, although many works have previously argued the contrary, there *was* a central theme to the movements at the outset (which manifested itself in the form of the M22M in France and the SDS in the U.S.), and that the more orthodox and doctrinaire revolutionary groups that later infiltrated and attempted to steer the movements, were quite alien to that theme. The discussion then develops (firstly with the United States and then with France) into an analysis of the ideological mentors of the New Left, historical and contemporary, and then the characteristic features of the revolt as ideology was put into practice. The chapter concludes with an assessment of the ideological achievements of the New Left in the Sixties in France and the U.S.

A common theme running through works dedicated to the upsurge of radicalism in the 1960s tends to be the essential eclecticism of the movements. In France in particular, this characteristic was singled out very early by French political scientist Edgar Morin in his study 'La Commune Etudiante'[1]. According to Morin and numerous others since, the ambivalence created by this apparent diversity was able to draw together everybody from already committed Marxist revolutionaries to hitherto unpoliticised students concerned that their studies neither guaranteed them a job, nor gave them intellectual or personal satisfaction. This impression of confusion and diversity has been aptly observed by British historian of the French left, Michael Kelly:

> "The student milieu became a seething cauldron of ideas during the intoxicating spring 'contestation'. The multiplicity of groups and the variety of opinion created a highly diversified and dynamic process of collective reflection, most of which lay within, or on the margins of Marxism. Communists, Maoists, Trotskyists, anarchists, situationists, existentialists and others thrashed out their differences and agreements with vehemence and often violence."[2]

Similarly, in the U.S. the strengths and weaknesses of the movement have been frequently interpreted as being derived from its inherent flexibility and openness in the face of factional conflict.[3] Hence, arguments have tended to focus upon the fragmentation of both French and American movements as a consequence of this eclectic nature. For example, Bernard Brown concluded in 1974 that: "the student and worker movements, far from being united in their opposition to a new ruling class of 'techno-bureaucrats' had altogether different goals, and in addition, were internally fragmented."[4]

As an extension of this line of argument, many historians have taken the view that the 'old left' factions in particular utilised the idealism and utopianism of 1960s youth to attempt to create their own style of revolutionary situation, that they planned this all along, and that they had control over developments throughout.[5] However, for the most part, these groups misread the potential explosiveness of early developments until quite late in the struggle. The characteristics of irrationality, extreme subjectivity and spontaneity were fundamentally central to the spirit of the movements, and 'old left' ideologies of rigid dogmatism were antithetical to the whole meaning of the Sixties revolt.

What ideological references can be attached to the student movements in France and the United States? All political movements owe some indebtedness to historical political theories, however much they may claim to be 'new'. Ehud Sprinzak has called these historical points of reference, "symbol makers",[6] and, although some in the Sixties acted as their own symbol makers,[7] it is clear that many of the symbols, images and ideas communicated by the ideological leaders were not original and could not realistically be expected to be so.

Amongst those most quoted, Herbert Marcuse, the German-American philosopher-sociologist tends to stand out in the literature in the United States. Marcuse's revolutionary philosophy was generally built around marginal groups: the alienated in society, such as the blacks, the poor, rebellious students and the hippies. In books like Eros and Civilisation and One Dimensional Man, Marcuse lamented the failure to find a new proletariat to challenge the new technocracy, considering organised labour as a "handmaiden of the liberal corporate state."[8] Marcuse held a utopian vision of liberated man, and, deriving much inspiration from Marx and Freud, attempted to make a synthesis between socialism and psychoanalysis. Liberation for Marcuse meant the release of erotic energy from the impositions of capitalism and technocracy:

> "Democratic capitalism has made us sublimated slaves, mistaking servitude for freedom.... The price of ever-mounting affluence and the illusion of power and success spewed out by advertising and the media becomes more centralised control and repression."[9]

It is not difficult to see how this kind of theory could appear attractive to the student radical embroiled in his battle against a faceless bureaucratic society, especially since Marcuse particularly singled out students and intellectuals as the new shock troops of revolution. However, the irony of the situation lay in the fact that although Marcuse had far more faith in a revolution succeeding in France, his influence was far more pervasive in the United States. For all his polemics on the revolutionary vanguard of the alienated and the need for subjectivity and consciousness in the revolutionary process, by June 1968, Marcuse was to admit that "because there is no collaboration between the students and the workers, not even on the level on which it occurred in France, I cannot imagine a revolution without the working class."[10] Indeed, many commentators have questioned whether Marcuse had any real influence on the practical development of the New Left in the U.S. In an article entitled "The Nature and Causes of Student Unrest", Trevor Fisk, the leader of the British National Union of Students for 1968 argued that:

> "The distinctive trait of the American New Left is that, until now, its theoretical ideas have come more from the experience of political struggle than from conscious intellectual effort...Not even writers such as Marcuse, who can be considered the theoretical interpreter of some of the values exemplified by the ongoing movement can be said to have led or inspired it."[11]

Possibly more influential as an early symbol maker was the maverick American sociologist, C. Wright Mills, with his 'power elite' theories formulated in 1956.[12] In a similar way to Marcuse, Mills saw in intellectuals and students a major potential base for new revolutionary movements, based on the contention that students have tended to remain a source of new radical leadership through history, whilst other elements of society have dramatically fluctuated. The critique of American society in the "Port Huron Statement" was in large part formulated on the basic ideas of Mills, and Ehud Sprinzak pinpointed the sociologist as being responsible for the initial "crisis of confidence" which was so much a feature of the 1962 document.[13] Mills was one of the first to refute Daniel Bell's "end of ideology" theories, which basically argued that modern society in its 'democratic' form had integrated all groups and classes and that the western democracies had seen the end of conflict. However, Mills too, rejected the traditional working class as a base, as he illustrated in a 1960 interview for New Left Review:

> "What I do not quite understand about some New Left writers is why they cling so mightily to the "working class" of the advanced capitalist societies as the historical agency or even as the most important agency in the face of the really impressive historical evidence that now stands against this expectation. Such a metaphysic, I think, is a legacy from Victorian Marxism that is now quite unrealistic....Who is it that is getting disgusted with what Marx called "all the old crap." It is the young intelligentsia."[14]

However, not even Mills could really present an alternative realistic vision of American society to which the New Left could cling. As Tom Hayden, one of the originators and leading lights of SDS theory, pointed out later in the 'Agenda for a Generation', "C. Wright Mills is appealing and dynamic in his expression of theory....but his pessimism yields us no formulas, no path out of the dark, and his polemicism sometimes offends the critical sense."[15]

Other names, particularly from the 1950s, which have often been connected with the early, idealistic, libertarian New Left include Paul Goodman, Allen Ginsberg, Jack Kerouac, David Riesman and Erich Fromm. Riesman and Fromm criticised specifically the conformity which characterised a passive and manipulable American public in the 1950s. Conformity, they argued, stifled self-awareness and hence produced alienation, an idea which the early SDS leaders took very seriously. There was, as a result, a high degree of awareness in the early New Left that ideology had to be built from an intimate knowledge of society's conflicts and problems.[16]

On a more cultural level, the early influences of a kind of utopian anarchism, mysticism and Zen Buddhism can be put down to the writings of 'pseudo'-anarchists like Goodman, Ginsberg and Kerouac. In the work, Growing Up Absurd, Goodman preached spontaneity in art, love and politics and advocated the idea of utopian community, whilst Ginsberg called for a rejection of materialism, conformism and bourgeois values in general in his famous poem 'Howl'.[17] There was, added to this, a very strong influence from the old IWW Wobblies in all three of these theorists, particularly Kerouac. What must be questioned however, is how profound the true impact of these radicals was in reality. It is unlikely that many student activists had attempted indepth studies of these writers, even though the names seem to have kept cropping up throughout much of the New Left literature of the 1960s.

One trend however, which can be identified in the principles and ideals of the early SDS would seem to be a harking back to the old American traditions of populism, and revolutionary and constitutional ideals of the Eighteenth Century. It was felt most strongly that the corporate liberalism of the 1950s and 1960s had been gradually perverting the glorious ideals upon which the nation had originally been built.[18] As an article entitled 'Freedom Now' in New Left Notes suggested:

> "There is, in reality as well as in rhetoric what past SDS National Secretary, Paul Booth has called a 'lineage of radicalism' in American history, which runs back to the 'revolutionary spirit' of the Eighteenth Century, 'a vital tradition of radicals and radical movements resumed in our time.'"[19]

In fact, utopian idealism was a prominent feature of early New Left thought. Many of the early activists felt that politics was missing that vital utopian element of the possible, and attacked Bell's 'end of ideology' school with a call to create new utopias and new ideologies. This point was made explicitly clear in "Agenda For a Generation":

> "No! You false liberals are suffering from the failure of your youthful dreams. You are justifying disinterest in morality, you are eliminating emotion, dissent, outrage and the wellsprings of life itself."[20]

Intimately connected with these traditions and principles was the idea of a "humanist and moralistic reformation"[21] and the dream of creating a society based on honesty, openness and community. However, the early SDS leaders also had faith in the potential of human beings as individuals, as this particular extract from the "Port Huron Statement" illustrates:

> "We regard men as infinitely precious and possessed of unfulfilled capacities for freedom and love...We oppose the depersonalisation that reduces human beings to the status of things...Men have unrealised potential for self-cultivation, self-direction, self-understanding and creativity...The goal of man and society should be human independence." [22]

Herein lies possibly the central theme behind the 'New' Left, as it stood in the first half of the 1960s: a strongly moralistic assertion of the priorities of the individual. This characteristic feature of the movement provides a dual definition (both sides apparently contradicting one another) of libertarian-socialism and communitarian-populism. It would seem, that from an ideological standpoint, the two were merged into a common denominator in the form of the major principle of "Participatory Democracy." As eminent American journalist, Lawrence Lader has pondered:

> "There was something curiously old-fashioned about this emphasis on classic individualism. What was new however, perhaps the most radical section of the Manifesto, was the demand that everyone must control the decisions and resources on which their lives depended."[23]

There was undoubtedly something of the French idea of autogestion (workers' control of the work place) in the practice of participatory democracy, especially in the positive idea of politics, the practice of decision-making at public groupings, the desire for community and the encouragement of opposition and open discussion. For the student activist in the SDS, the degree of choice society afforded the individual was insufficient. Democracy and freedom were seen as realistic ideals yet to be achieved. Elections and suggestion boxes were not considered to embody the true definition of democracy. The students of SDS argued that community should provide the basis for a consensus of discussion rather than one of manipulation, a view illustrated in the "Port Huron Statement":

> "Society should be organised not for minority participation but for majority participation in decision-making....Personal links between man and man are needed.[24]

So all these views implied a rejection of the existing 'democracy' in the United States, a turning against the 'mass' and impersonal character of American life. The student radicals believed that American democracy was of a form controlled largely by the mass media, in the sense that opinion was generally consolidated behind decisions that had already been made, rather than individuals participating in discussions and arriving at decisions based on such discussions. For the student leaders of SDS, the true democratic process involved immediate confrontation and discussion, as an SDS working paper from 1965 shows:

> "The America which we face denies democracy - it is a nation in which crucial economic decisions which affect us all are made by corporate managers and bankers, in which millions of people are dependent on the indulgence of public welfare systems over which they have no control, in which the decisions of war and peace are made by a clique of advisers and experts. Can this be a democracy? We understand democracy to be that system of rule in which the people make the decisions that affect their lives....In America, community is practically non-existent."[25]

Also inevitably connected with the idea of participatory democracy was the call for a highly decentralised social system, in which the economic and political units whose decisions affected individuals would be small enough that those individuals could be directly involved in their decision-making processes.[26] However, (and to an extent in this way quite different from the French case) another important element in early New Left ideology seems to have been the belief that industrialism was an essential and immovable fact of life, and that the New Left was a purely urban rebellion.[27] Also contrary to the French situation, this faith in modernisation caused contradictions for the American radicals in their attempt to create a new ideology. The question often arose as to whether the ideas of participatory democracy and community organisation could be compatible with the growth of industrial urbanisation.[28]

This discussion of names, items and definitions is all very well, but in reality we are still missing the true character of the movement: the gut feeling of rebellion against conformity, the importance of action and spontaneity over stale ideological debate, and the spirit of irrational, subjective revolt. In essence, the new radicalism of the 1960s was based on experience rather than theory. The call to action and the importance of expediency took precedence over ideological and tactical constraints. This characteristic can be seen in both the French and American cases. The politics of experience incorporated a capacity to bring relevant experience of relative powerlessness or hidden oppression into the people's consciousness. This was essentially what the Sixties movement was all about, and ultimately, the factor that made most liberal reformists and traditional Marxist-Leninists extremely wary of this radical idealism. Greg Calvert put it this way in his 1967 speech "In White America":

> "Radical or revolutionary consciousness is the perception of oneself as unfree, as oppressed - and finally it is the discovery of oneself as one of the oppressed who must unite to transform the objective conditions of their existence in order to resolve the contradiction between potentiality and actuality. Revolutionary consciousness leads to the struggle for one's own freedom in unity with others who share the burden of oppression."[29]

Hence, what was considered vital was the faith in one's own direct experience in the process of understanding reality.

In the radical idealist's ideology, consciousness preceded theory, and this consciousness was a product of alienation, true of both France and the U.S.[30]

Although there was more of a party organisational base in SDS than in the M22M, the political practice of the American radicals was fairly similar to that of the French neo-anarchists: essentially that of shock. Ad-hoc expediency and spontaneity were as much a feature of American student radicalism in the Sixties as the headline-hitting antics of the Nanterre and Sorbonne activists. The "Port Huron Statement" emphasised this element of reaction to immediate events: "It has been an almost instinctive opposition. We have been hurt by what exists, and we have responded in outrage and compassion."[31] Action was generally based on a need to confront immediately serious individual problems which existed in the racial, political, economic and civil realms. To quote a National Secretary Report in New Left Notes in early 1967, "Neither ideological clarity nor organisational stability are fundamentally important to SDS'ers. What counts is that which creates movement."[32] A discussion in Studies on the Left, the University of Wisconsin left-wing Monthly, in the Spring of 1965, between Tom Hayden and the editorial staff of the review, illustrates the ongoing disagreements over the issue of organisation of the New Left. In an editorial the previous month, the editorial staff had called for "a coalition of old and new left, a new Socialist Party; at least a common and guiding radical ideology, a radical centre." Hayden however, disagreed with this approach:

> "This seemed to me an artificial attempt to order the chaos of the contemporary left....A radical centre is an overly administrative concept, a false way of making the insubstantial substantial. It is a way of sliding over the frightening possibility that American radicalism may be baseless and doomed."[33]

The final, and probably most significant feature of the American New Left in the 1960s was a rejection of the politics of reason. The philosophical idealism of the New Left was, above all, a rejection of positivism, particularly in its attacks on technological rationality.[34] Similarly, in a more political context, as American sociologist Irwing Louis Horowitz argued in 1970:

> "Rationality, whether in the form of American pragmatism or European historicism is viewed as characterising the 'old left.' What has occurred is a replication of the traditional problem within the Left between advocates of action and advocates of determinism."[35]

Hence, 1960s radicalism in its ideological form was also originally a reaction against Marxism as a scientific historiography, at least until it was forced into a more orthodox Marxist position in the late Sixties. Horowitz continued:

> "The Marxist hero is a teacher organiser on behalf of

> historical law which he must enfold. He is a leading strategist of class war and imposes organisation to win that war, to fulfil a class responsibility and destiny for social reorganisation. But to irrationalist leftism, he is merely preparing another class elite for rule, failing to touch the real wellsprings of unity among men, his is a victim of the revolution he serves, which is both a Sorelian and a New Left concept."[36]

Here, it would seem, Horowitz was misdirecting his interpretation. Although he was specifically dealing with the American situation, much of what he had to say could be more appropriately related to the French Student Movement. Horowitz attempted to link the New Left of the Sixties in the U.S. with the _fin de siècle_ French irrationalist doctrines of Sorel, Bergson, Péguy and Le Bon, and their attempted liberation from deterministic theory: "This is the first generation in American Society, at least in this century, to combine political radicalism with irrationalism. As in the age of Sorel, reason has been displaced by passion."[37]

Although, much of this can be seen in the activities of the SDS'ers of the 1960s, Horowitz puts far too much emphasis on his connection between 'turn of the century' irrationalists and the 1960s New Left. For example, Horowitz points out himself that Sorel emphasised pastoral values and recognised the high potential of the peasantry for drastic revolution and social change,[38] and, whilst this could plausibly be applied to the French neo-anarchists and situationists-surrealists, there is some doubt as to its compatibility with the SDS's faith in industrialism. Nevertheless, the importance of emotion and passion in place of rational behaviour was still a strong characteristic in both the French and American student movements.

To move on specifically to the ideological references of the French movement, with rich radical European traditions to draw from, men like Daniel Cohn-Bendit and his activist-ideologue 'comrades' in the M22M had plenty of historical antecedents to refer to in the creation of revolutionary theory. Many labels and traditions have been attached to Cohn-Bendit and the M22M's interpretations of revolutionary theory; from Sorelian- or anarcho-syndicalism to an expression of utopian communism and from communitarianism to a counter-utopia of libertarianism.[39] It can not be an easy task to attempt to restrict to a simple definition such a wide spectrum of characteristics. Cohn-Bendit himself referred to the M22M as "the result of arduous research into revolutionary theory and practice."[40]

This research went back as far as the mid-nineteenth century and the origins of the long standing controversy between the anarchists and the socialists.[41] Revolutionaries like Cohn-Bendit believed the seeds of socialist authoritarianism were sown with Lenin and even Marx himself, arguing that the European working class should not have moved away from the libertarian socialism of Proudhon and Bakunin. As Daniel Singer has suggested: "In the French May Movement there were discernible anti-authoritarian echoes of Proudhon as well as Bakunin."[42] According to Proudhon and Bakunin, the masses had tc be educated rather than led, an idea dating back to Proudhon's views on the masses at the time of the 1848 revolutions. Revolutions, Proudhon argued, were not brought about by initiators, but by the spontaneity of the people. These ideas of revolution from the base up, were taken up later by Bakunin.[43] In 1968, Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the prominent leader of the neo-anarchists in the M22M, specifically acknowledged Bakunin as the greatest single influence on his revolutionary ideas, adding, "I am still an anarchist...in the line of the socialism of councils."[44]

This idea of libertarian socialism created through workers' councils was to be the problem for Lenin in interpreting Marxism in Russia during and after 1917. "All power to the Soviets" was essentially an anarchist idea, dating from the self-management of the 1848 workers' associations, and for the anarchists in 1968, particularly Cohn-Bendit, the failure of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia to establish truly libertarian socialism was a betrayal of the revolutionary tradition. Neo-anarchist activists like Cohn-Bendit held little respect for Lenin and Trotsky, since they were responsible, in the eyes of the student radicals, for both holding back the spontaneous struggle of the masses between February and October 1917 and later turning the revolution into a bureaucratic counter-revolution.[45]

As such, figures like Rosa Luxemburg and Anton Pannekoek, theorists of workers councils around the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, were also admired by the French radical students in 1968.[46] In particular, they found their true models of organisation for future libertarian society in various revolutionary experiences of the workers. The Comité des Enragés identified these at a Council Meeting of 30th May 1968:

> "The proletarian revolution drafted these forms in the Councils of St. Petersburg in 1905, in Turin in 1920, in Catalonia in 1936, and in Budapest in 1956. Workers' councils are obviously the only solution."[47]

One historical figure who particularly stood out in the writings of the enragés was Nestor Makhno. Makhno was a young Ukrainian anarchist and opponent of Lenin and Trotsky during and after the October Revolution. Cohn-Bendit emphasised the importance of the Makhnovites:

> "The Makhnovchina, better perhaps than any other movement shows that the Russian Revolution could have become a great liberating force...It shows the Bolsheviks stifling workers and peasants with lies and calumnies, and then crushing them with a bloody massacre."[48]

The Makhno Movement was centred around the Ukrainian town of Gulye Polye and flourished from 1918 to the Summer of 1921, before finally being put down by the Red Army under Trotsky. It was a local movement which had been disillusioned by the post-revolutionary authoritarianism of the Bolshevik party and the centralisation of power around a few party leaders. They called for independent, autonomous soviets in which no authority would be exercised from above. The messages of the Makhnovites sounded uncannily similar to many of the speeches and discussions within the M22M in the Spring of 1968:

> "We call for the free election of workers' councils, which will not rule by arbitrary laws because no true soviet system can be authoritarian. Ours is the purest form of socialism, anti-authoritarian and anti-government, it calls for the free organisation of the social life of the workers independent of authority.."[49]

For Cohn-Bendit, Makhno's defeat in 1921 spelled the end of the revolution.[50] The French anarchist's loyalty to the ideas of the Ukrainian anarchists might be traced back to the influence of a contemporary anarchist sociologist, Daniel Guerin, who had, in early 1968 written the introduction to an edition of an autobiographical work by Makhno on his rebellion.[51] It is quite plausible that Cohn-Bendit could have come in contact with Guerin's ideas before 1968, since the sociologist was a university lecturer at the time in Paris.

Cohn-Bendit also seems to have been fascinated by the Kronstadt sailors' mutiny in Petrograd in 1921. In a similar movement to that demonstrated by Makhno and his followers, the Kronstadt sailors rejected their soviets because they believed them to be no longer working for the benefit of the workers and peasants; "Our cause is just....we stand for the power of the Soviets, not for that of the party."[52] Again, the Bolshevik repression against this commune was extremely severe and the sailors at Kronstadt seem to have served as more martyrs to the neo- anarchists' cause in 1968.

Can the neo-anarchist ideas of the M22M be equated with the early libertarian principles of the SDS to any extent? Theoretically, there seems to be little difference. The libertarian features of participatory democracy, at least on paper, appear to be quite similar to the guiding principles of the M22M: permanent circulation of ideas, plurality and diversity, and total revocability of representatives.

However, the neo-anarchists of the M22M did go further than their U.S. contemporaries, both in theory and (especially) in action. As an interview with Cohn-Bendit and Duteuil, the spokesmen of the M22M, illustrated, the role of the worker was emphasised far more in the neo-anarchism of the French revolutionaries. When asked to describe their ideal society for the future, they replied: "A federation of workers councils, soviets, a classless society, a society where the social division of labour between manual and intellectual workers no longer exists."[53] As well, there were no limitations placed on the proposed freedom of the individual as there were in SDS theory. As Cohn-Bendit pointed out: "the final goal is the unimpeded liberty of the individual."[54] In its practical form however, little more can be said of the differences between the neo-anarchism and libertarianism of the Sixties student movements, except that the former manifested itself in France in far more sudden and violent terms than the latter in the U.S.[55]

Certain commentators have suggested other, more contemporary, external influences on the thought and actions of the French student revolt. These figures have included the German-American philosopher Marcuse, the French anarchist Regis Debray and the Southern and Central American revolutionaries, Che Guevara and Fidel Castro.

The contemporary French Marxist sociologist Henri Lefebvre was one of the most vocal in emphasising the relevance of Marcuse's work to the French student movement, particularly in his views on the rationalisation and integration of modern French society. As such, he connected Marcuse's "junction of the erotic and political in youth" with the triumph of imagination, passion and desire in May 1968.[56] Another advocate of the impact of Marcuse has been historian Keith Reader who, in his work Intellectuals and the Left in France claimed that "Marcuse's One Dimensional Man was a key text of what might be called the 'socialism of affluence'."[57] Although it may not have been a conscious element, Reader continued, the actions of the French students were certainly a reflection of the sentiment. For sure, this was not a conscious factor, since virtually all the student leaders in May 1968 stated quite categorically that very few of the student radicals had read either of Marcuse's major works. For example, in an interview with Hervé Bourges, Duteuil of the M22M remarked regarding the philosopher,-"Some people have tried to force Marcuse on us as a mentor; that is a joke. None of us have read Marcuse."[58] As well, the leader of the Teachers' Union, SNESup, Alain Geismar admitted:

> "I must say that, to my knowledge, none of the militants in my union, in the UNEF or in any other organisation, with the possible exception of one in a thousand, has ever read a line of the author who is presented to us as the great precursor to the struggles taking place in universities the world over."[59]

Hence, it would seem that the message of Marcuse did not reach French youth until after the crisis, and, as Daniel Singer has surmised: "The revulsion against the repressive consumer society was not prompted by a special message. It was in the air."[60]

In fact, many of these interpretations could be referred just as appropriately to the role of another "trend-setting" group prominent in May 1968, the Situationnistes, the French branch of the International Situationist. This group was an offshoot of the 1930s surrealist movement and was the closest embodiment of a cultural revolt within the May Movement. The situationists not only repudiated science and technology, but also questioned abstract logic, concerned themselves with magic and the occult and delved into the literature of the fantastic.[61] In a similar way to the French anarchists they resented the blind conformity which characterised technocratic society. Above all, they attacked the 'society of the spectacle', by which society marginalised the majority of its members to passive, observer status.[62] The role of the situationists, it must be stressed, was vital in setting the mood of the early student movement. Their aesthetic surrealism and extreme political radicalism combined forced the character of the student revolt, revealed in the form of slogans, graffiti and a coherent and seductive ideology,[63] and popularised later by film directors such as Jean Luc Godard and Francois Truffaut. The 'spirit of '68' can certainly be seen in the themes inspired by the young surrealists. Banners heralding "power to the imagination" and demanding "take your desires for reality"[64] were definitely more reminiscent of the heyday of surrealism than any more strictly political origin. As Keith Reader has suggested:

> "May 1968 was not (or not strictly or not primarily) an intellectual movement. The word that best distils the spirit of the time is 'imagination', present in or behind the wall slogans that were such an important feature of May."[65]

Essentially, the ultimate goal of the situationists was a state of "complete untrammelled individual creativity."[66]

As for more contemporary ideological influences, Daniel Singer stressed the anti-imperialist struggle, including in his calculations, Debray, Castro and Guevara. Undoubtedly, these figures were looked on as martyrs or icons in the revolutionary cause,[67] (as a glance at any heavily postered wall in Paris in May 1968 would reveal) but could they be realistically viewed as ideological catalysts to the student revolt? Certainly, the fact that Guevara had died for the cause and Debray was rotting in a Bolivian prison for his commitment to third world revolution served as a useful rallying symbol. However, these were not deep ideological issues, and few of the student radicals had any real faith in the application of Third World situations (whether in Bolivia, Cuba or Vietnam) to modern technological society.[68] Probably the only way in which such a link was anticipated was in the idea of street violence in the form of an urban guerrilla force made up of students and young workers, only consciously applied by the JCR Trotskyists.[69]

One of the vital characteristics of the French May Movement which could be equated with its American counterpart was the espousing of the causes of decentralisation and regionalism. This, related to the hatred for centralised bureaucracy, whether right wing or left wing, can be seen clearly in a pamphlet distributed by the organisation most committed to regionalism and decentralisation in France in 1968, the Comité d'Action pour la révolution Socialiste des Régions: "a socialism which has not decentralised the powers of decision-making is merely a reformist demagogy."[70] However, the French revolutionaries differed from their American counterparts in one crucial area. As Bernard Brown argued:

> "Anarchism and situationism may be viewed as ideologies of total, unyielding resistance to

> modernisation in all of its aspects. Every feature of modern society is repudiated, the centralised state, hierarchy, bureaucracy, division of labour, science, technology, assembly lines, urban living, rationality and organisation."[71]

The New Leftists in the U.S. fundamentally accepted modernisation and industrialism with all their trappings and implications whereas the French student revolt encapsulated a total rejection not only of centralism, but also the essence of post-capitalist technological society.[72]

The final two themes dealt with in this chapter are the ones which most characterised the practical expression of the movement in both France and the U.S. The first of these was extreme subjectivity. The educational debate of the Sixties involved a rejection of the academic supremacy of neutral or objective knowledge, and the objective place students were destined to occupy in society. In France particularly, this was extended to the political arena, illustrated in the polemics of the student leaders and spokesmen. Participation was everything. No one could 'sit on the fence' and attempt to avoid confrontation. As Cohn-Bendit stipulated at a Sorbonne meeting on May 28th, "The movement will always remain subjective, it is incapable of being objective. Anyone who is weak or undecided is a reactionary."[73]

Last, and probably most important, was the spontaneity and extreme violence of the movement, particularly advocated by and embodied in the M22M. As Alain Touraine assessed:

> "The strength of the M22M lay in its lack of organisation and its constant appeal to spontaneity and to a personal and collective responsibility that permitted it to transcend the very limited area of action of the Trotskyite or Maoist little groups."[74]

Basically, in the early days of the student revolt, the M22M recognised the crucial role of direct action and direct participation in the mobilisation of revolutionary consciousness. The emphasis undoubtedly lay in the domination of action over theory and the benefits of a practical daily programme.[75] This perhaps explains the spontaneous response of students who had not previously been connected with any particular political or intellectual group. The unity created amongst the students, especially in the week from May 3rd to May 11th, was practical and on the level of concrete action and not ideological or doctrinal. The active minority saw it as their task to arouse the passive majority, inciting them to action by transforming their latent discontent and vague rebelliousness into a coherent revolutionary vision. This Cohn-Bendit and his activist colleagues did by provoking the authorities into repressive measures, and hence developing a sense of solidarity and consciousness of collective power amongst the students. In the early days of May, the movement's unity was carried by its own momentum. The spontaneous nature of the riots and occupations generated this unity and solidarity. In Philippe Labro's book Ce n'est qu'un début, one militant explained the way it worked:

> "If a bunch of guys get together and talk about Marx, they disagree and start to argue: 'You are a shit, you are a counter-revolutionary, You don't understand anything about Marx' etc. But if you give them a specific task, like the occupation of a building, then they either do it or not; that is, they are either revolutionary or not...Who gives a damn what you think about Marx?"[76]

Hence, Cohn-Bendit and Duteuil claimed in interview with Hervé Bourges that, "Our movement's strength is precisely that it is based on an uncontrollable spontaneity, that it gives an impetus without trying to canalise it or use the action it has unleased to its own profit."[77]

What was the significance of the Sixties student movements, ideologically speaking, in France and the United States? Both movements undoubtedly caused people to be shocked out of the complacency that had developed in the 'affluent' Fifties. Also, they put paid to theorists like Daniel Bell and Raymond Aron, who had spoken at the end of the 1950s of an "end of ideology." Those who had believed that society had reached its optimum stage of development in the western democracies by the beginning of the Sixties were forced to think again. The early New Left in both France and the United States made people painfully aware that there were still profound and inherent inequalities even in societies termed 'affluent'.

In the United States, probably one of the most marked achievements of the New Left movement was to re-awaken (if only for a time) an awareness of the original principles upon which the nation had been founded. It seemed that the nation had lost sight of its very 'raison d'être', and to an extent, the SDS succeeded in rediscovering such a consciousness. The problems in society with which the SDS concerned itself most, the war in Vietnam, the black rights movement in the south and the plight of the poor, seemed to epitomise the underlying contradictions existing in American society between the original guiding principles of the nation and the contemporary reality.

In France, where the revolt was far more sudden and immediate than its American counterpart, consequences also tended to be more extreme: the immediate Gaullist recovery in the July elections being one example. However, because of the severity of the threat to the government in power during May and June, many immediate concessions were achieved by the students with regard to their university related grievances. Also, on a more lasting scale, many of the contradictions, inequalities and archaic institutions of Gaullist France were exposed by the revolt, and indeed, only a year later de Gaulle stepped down as president. The French students had not only made their voices heard for two months, but had led the entire country to a standstill.

Chapter three examines the roles played by the various exponents of "old left" ideology in the Sixties, from Marxist-Leninists to often more militant Trotskyists and Maoists. It will show how these splinter groups attempted to impose their strict, formal doctrines on the originally spontaneous radical student movements for their own, quite different revolutionary ends. Both the SDS and the M22M had to come to terms with this threat, and an account of the evolutionary developments of both movements will provide some insight into how successful (or not) they were in dealing with such infiltration.

ENDNOTES TO CHAPTER TWO

1. See E. Morin, La Commune Etudiante (Paris; Fayard 1968). Also, for similar views, see more up-to-date works; for example, Keith Reader, Intellectuals and the Left in France (New York; St. Martin's Press, 1987) and Michael Kelly, Modern French Marxism (Baltimore; John Hopkins University, 1982).

2. Kelly, Modern French Marxism. p.176

3. For examples of this opinion see E.G. Romm, The Open Conspiracy. What America's Angry Generation is Saying (New York; K.S. Giniger, 1970) and David Bouchier Idealism and Revolution. New Ideologies of Liberation in Britain and the United States (London; Edward Arnold, 1978).

4. B. Brown, Protest in Paris. Anatomy of a Revolt (New Jersey; General Learning Press, 1974).p.3

5. For this particular type of interpretation see Ehud Zelig Sprinzak. "Democracy and Illegitimacy: A Study of the American and French Student Protest Movements and some Theoretical Implications" (Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1971) for the French case, and Irving Howe (ed.) Beyond the New Left (New York, Mcall, 1970) pp.2-5 for the U.S. perspective as examples.

6. E. Sprinzak, "Democracy and Illegitimacy. A Study of the American and French student protest movements and some theoretical implications". pp.373-86

7. Although these still derived much from historical figures, Daniel Cohn-Bendit in France and Mario Savio at Berkeley could be seen as acting as their own symbol makers (see Sprinzak p.374). A study of many of Cohn-Bendit's speeches and particularly Savio's "An End to History" speech at Sproul Hall, Berkeley might confirm this.

8. For the quotation, see H. Marcuse, One Dimensional Man (Boston; Beacon, 1964) p.9.

Also see Eros and Civilisation: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud (Boston; Beacon, 1955) for Marcuse's views on Technocratic Society and man's possible escapes from its constraints.

9. H. Marcuse, One Dimensional Man p.32.

10. Sol Stern interview with Marcuse for Ramparts Magazine June 29th, 1968 p.55-8.

11. B. Crick and W.A. Robson (ed) Protest and Discontent (Middlesex; Penguin, 1970) p.80.

12. See C.W. Mills, The Power Elite (New York; Oxford University Press, 1956).

13. See E. Sprinzak. "Democracy and Illegitimacy" p.385.

14. Interview by C. Wright Mills for New Left Review Sept/Oct. 1960.

15. From the Port Huron Statement, "Agenda for a Generation", June 1962 taken from M. Cohen and D. Hale (ed) The New Student Left: An Anthology p.3-4.

16. For Riesman's and Fromm's opinions on the problems of American Society, see David Riesman, The Lonely Crowd: A Study of the changing American Character (New Haven; Yale University Press, 1950) and Erich Fromm, The Sane Society (New York; Rinehart, 1955)

17. Lawrence Lader, Power on the Left p.171.

18. A fine example of this can be found in Carl Oglesby's "Trapped In a System" speech at Washington DC on October 27th 1965, where Oglesby sets up a hypothetical discussion between two men who he considered to be the bastions of American human rights from the late eighteenth century, Tom Paine and Thomas Jefferson, and two he believed to have perverted these ideals the most, Lyndon Johnson and McGeorge Bundy.

19. Article from New Left Notes, October 14th 1966 entitled "Freedom Now" p.7.

20. "Port Huron Statement. Agenda For a Generation. " June 1962 taken from Cohen and Hale (ed.) The New Student Left: An Anthology.p.4.

21. Oglesby, "Trapped in a System" speech, Washington D.C.1965.

22. "Port Huron Statement. Agenda for a Generation" p.3.

23. Lawrence Lader, Power on the Left p.174.

24. From the "Port Huron Statement", M. Cohen and D. Hale, The New Student Left: An Anthology pp.12-3.

25. Paul Booth & Lee Webb, a mimeographed SDS paper from Ann Arbor, Michigan, entitled "The anti-war movement. From protest to radical politics" printed in New Left Notes, February 15th 1965.

26. J. Foster & D. Long (ed.), Protest! Student Activism in America (N.Y; William Morrow & Co Inc, 1970) pp.188-95.

27. Cohen and Hale (ed) The New Student Left: An Anthology, from the Introduction, p.xxv.

28. Cohen and Hale, The New Student Left p.xxv

29. Greg Calvert, "In White America - Radical Consciousness and Social Change". A speech reprinted in The National Guardian March 25th 1967 and also quoted in M. Teodori, The New Left: A Documentary History p.415 and K. Sale, S.D.S. p.318.

30. See D. Bouchier, Idealism and Revolution: New Ideologies of Liberation in Britain and the United States p.54.

31. From the "Port Huron Statement", out of Cohen and Hale (ed.) The New Student Left: An Anthology p.8.

32. National Secretary's Report from New Left Notes January 13th 1967, p.1.

33. These two quotations taken from Studies on the Left - Spring 1965 from M. Teodori, The New Left: A Documentary History, p.209-212.

34. D. Bouchier, Idealism and Revolution p.8

35. Irving Louis Horowitz, The Struggle is the Message. The Organisation and Ideology of the Antiwar Movement (Berkeley; Glendessary Press, 1970) p.19.

36. I.L. Horowitz, The Struggle is the Message p.92.

37. I.L. Horowitz, The Struggle is the Message p.84.

38. See Horowitz, The Struggle is the Message p.90.

39. For these various interpretations see both Sprinzak's Ph.D. thesis "Democracy and Illegitimacy" and Touraine's book, The May Movement: Revolt and Reform May 1968.

40. D. & G. Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism: The Left Wing Alternative p.16.

41. D. & G. Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism pp.16-8.

42. D. Singer, Prelude to Revolution p.357.

43. For excellent works on the early anarchists and libertarians, see George Woodcock, Anarchism (London; Penguin, 1963) and D. Guerin, L'Anarchisme (Paris; Gallimard, 1965).

44. See J.L. Brau, "Cours Camarade, le vieux monde est derrière toi" (Paris; Albin Michel, 1968) p.189-90. The "socialism of councils" refers to worker experiments in anarchism since Bakunin's time, including Turin in 1920, Catalonia in 1936 and Budapest in 1956.

45. D. & G. Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism p.221

46. B. Brown, Protest in Paris: Anatomy of a Revolt p.87. Also, for the influence of Luxemburg's ideas, see A. Geismar, from The Leaders Speak: The French Student Revolt May 1968 (London; Cape, 1968) p.40.

47. Committee of the Enragés (Situationist International) and Council for the Continuation of the Occupations, entitled An Address to All Workers May 30th 1968, taken from V. Fis ra, Writing on the Wall, France May 1968: A Documentary Anthology p.176.

48. D. & G. Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism p.220.

49. D. & G. Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism p.221.

50. D. & G. Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism pp.221-2

51. From N. Makhno. La Révolution Russe en Ukraine. (Paris, 1968 edition) Introduction by D. Guerin.

52. From Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism p.238.

53. D. Cohn-Bendit and J. Duteuil, from The Leaders Speak: The French Student Revolt May 1968 (London; Cape, 1968) p.55.

54. From B. Brown, Protest in Paris p.88-9.

55. In an article in La Feuille ANARchiste (no.5; Mai 1968) by A. Libertad, an attempt was made to distinguish between anarchism and libertarianism. The conclusion essentially came down to the argument that there was a difference of emphasis placed on liberty. "Libertarians make a dogma of liberty, whilst anarchists make it a mere expression. For the libertarian freedom is an inherent right, but for the anarchist it is merely one of the results of the success of his struggle." (transl. from the French) It has also been suggested that libertarianism is more of a philosophical principle, whilst anarchism tends to be the political or physical manifestation of it.

56. H. Lefebvre, The Explosion: Marxism and the French Revolution (London; Monthly Review Press, 1969) p.26.

57. K. Reader, Intellectuals and the Left in France p.8-9. In referring to the "socialism of affluence," Reader means that Marcuse had written off the industrial working class as "recuperated by the blandishments of consumer society", and looked instead to those outside the productive process, namely the students who had grown up in and reaped the material benefits of the affluent society of the '50s.

58. J. Duteuil from The Leaders Speak, an interview recorded some time between May 20th 1968 and June 1st 1968. p.58.

59. A. Geismar from The Leaders Speak, also between May 20th and June 1st. p.36-7.

60. D. Singer, Prelude to Revolution p.66.

61. B. Brown, Protest in Paris p.104.

62. See R. Fraser, 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt (N.Y; Pantheon, 1988) pp.83-4. Also, A. Touraine, The May Movement p.150.

63. For examples of graffiti and slogans in Paris in May 1968, see J. Besançon, Les Murs ont la Parole: Journal Mural, Mai '68 (Paris; Claude Tchou editeur, 1968) or Mai '68: Début d'une Lutte Prolongée (London; Dobson Books Ltd, 1969) Texts and Posters by Atelier Populaire.

64. P. Seale and M.McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag. p.69.

65. K. Reader, Intellectuals and the Left in France p.6.

66. Brown, Protest in Paris p.67.

67. Examples of this hero worship could be seen in Paris throughout May. The Enragés of Nanterre renamed the lecture theatre put at their disposal by Dean Grappin, Amphi Che Guevara. Whilst some of the Comités d'Action named themselves after the Bolivian martyr for example, Comité d'Action Freud/Che Guevara.

68. See the interview with Daniel Cohn-Bendit from The Leaders Speak: The French Student Revolt May 1968 pp.55-6.

69. P. Seale & M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag p.47.

70. Pamphlet entitled "Décolonisons la Province contre l'oppression capitaliste" dated 30th May, and distributed by

the Comité d'Action pour la révolution socialiste des regions (transl. from the French).

71. B. Brown, Protest in Paris p.209.

72. A. Touraine, The May Movement pp.265-7

73. D. Cohn-Bendit in a discussion at the Sorbonne, dated 28th May and approximately 10 o'clock in the evening, entitled "Intervention de Cohn-Bendit" from "Tracts de Mai" (transl. from the French).

74. From A. Touraine, The May Movement. p.270.

75. D. & G. Cohn-Bendit, Obsolete Communism p.230

76. P. Labro (et al.) Ce n'est qu'un début (Paris; Publications Premières, 1968) p.57,(transl. from the French).

77. D. Cohn-Bendit and J. Duteuil from The Leaders Speak: The French Student Revolt May 1968 p.78.

CHAPTER THREE

This chapter discusses the roles played by the various exponents of 'old left' ideology in the Sixties, from Marxist-Leninists to often more militant Trotskyists and Maoists. The term 'old left' in this chapter specifically refers to groups which, in the tradition of Marxism, believed in the need for a revolutionary vanguard or party. It shows how these splinter groups attempted to impose their own strict, formal doctrines on the originally spontaneous radical student movements for their own, quite different revolutionary ends. The discussion begins with an examination of the philosophies and stategies of the original revolutionary theorists, Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and Mao, and then proceeds to discuss firstly the characteristics of the various contemporary Maoist and Trotskyist groups in the Sixties, and the tactics they used to attempt to infiltrate the student movements in France and the United States. Following this is an assessment of the weaknesses of the SDS's ideological framework and how these weaknesses facilitated the infiltration into and takeover of the New Left in the U.S, particularly by the Progressive Labour Party. Finally, the chapter concludes with an analysis of the revolutionary debates which went on between the different student factions during the May revolt in France, and how the neo-anarchist _enragés_ of the M22M were by no means afraid of constantly redefining their ideological position when faced with the call by the 'old left' groups for some form of revolutionary organisation.

The impact of ideology on the student movements of the Sixties has been largely overlooked by scholars up to now.[1] In particular, most histories of the period pay scant regard to the influences of the 'old left' Marxist-Leninist, Trotskyist and Maoist student extremist groups in the "movements" which characterised the era in both the U. S. and France.[2] Indeed, Trotskyist and Maoist student groups, specifically, experienced a dramatic upsurge in popularity and membership during the turbulent Sixties. In both France and the U.S, the old ideologies had experienced very limited success prior to the 1960s, in spite of the strong Marxist tradition in France, and hence they were more than eager to attach themselves to any semblance of potential revolutionary activity.

This chapter deals with the most prominent of these 'old left' groupuscules and parties in France and the United States, paying particular attention to the methods they used to attempt to infiltrate the student movement as a whole and influence its direction with their peculiar ideological and tactical characteristics. A study of these groups is important, because they attempted to take control of a movement which was essentially and initially intended as an entirely 'new' phenomenon. First though, an attempt will be made to discuss the differences in philosophy and strategy of the revolutionary theorists, whose ideas were chiefly behind the attempted 'old left' revival of the Sixties, Leon Trotsky and Mao Zedong.

With the revitalisation of 'old left' factions accompanying the increasing political awareness of youth in the 1960s, the theories of Marx, Lenin, Trotsky and Mao were given a new lease of life. Both Trotsky and Mao started with Marxism as a base and accepted dialectical materialism as a science of societal development. Both also conceptualised the revolutionary process as developing over time with its own dialectical dynamic; in Trotsky's case this meant 'permanent revolution', whilst Mao's conception was one of 'uninterrupted revolution'.[3] The idea of 'permanent revolution' introduced a distinction between a minimum and a maximum stage in the revolutionary process. This differentiated between the bourgeois democratic stage and the true socialist revolution. Even a maximum programme could not be immediate, Trotsky decided, since it was necessary to raise the consciousness of a lagging proletariat in capitalist industrialised countries. His answer to this dilemma was the 'Transitional Programme', which became the programmatic document of his new Fourth International in the 1930s.[4] In it, he advanced a system of 'transitional demands' somewhere between the minimum and maximum programmes, which included such features as the extension of public works, workers' control in factories, the disclosure of business secrets and selective nationalisation. These were considered by Trotsky as a part of the revolutionary process, not a preliminary to it: in other words, a direct challenge to the power of the bourgeoisie. Mao, on the other hand, bent Marxism to the needs of Chinese society and developed the concept of the "mass line":

> "In all the practical work of our party, all correct leadership is necessarily from the masses, to the masses. This means, take the ideas of the masses and concentrate them (through study turn them into concentrated and systematic ideas) then go to the masses and propagate and explain these ideas until the masses embrace them as their own, hold fast to them, and translate them into action..... an endless spiral with ideas becoming more correct, more vital and richer all the time."[6]

This idea is particularly significant in the light of the tactics used by student Maoist groups in both France and the United States in the Sixties, involving the education of the workforce by going out into the factories.

Also implicit in both theorists' concepts of the ideal socialist state was the necessity for some form of democratic centralist revolutionary party, an idea inherited from Marx and Lenin. Lenin had argued in 1917 that, for the revolution to succeed, the consciousness of the proletariat was such that some form of hierarchy or party structure was needed as a means of educating the masses. Even within the Party, decision-making was to rest with the central organ, the National Congress. Democratic centralism basically meant that free discussion was permitted until the National Congress made a decision, after which all party members were bound to accept the decision and act upon it without question. This is a particularly significant feature of Trotsky's and Mao's ideas when examining the aims and strategies of the 'old left' groups in France and the U.S. in the student revolts of the Sixties. Democratic centralism necessarily involved some form of hierarchy. Mao put it this way:

> "The people cannot possibly exercise dictatorship over themselves ...What applies among the people is democratic centralism...This freedom is freedom with leadership, and this democracy is democracy under centralised guidance, not anarchy."[6]

All the Trotskyist and Maoist groups involved in the student riots in France and the U.S. believed in this Leninist idea of a centralist revolutionary elite, which would direct the revolution and then lead the new socialist state. However, as has already been indicated in chapter two, this was contrary to the original ideas of the New Left, and indeed, caused many contradictions and confusions within the 'old left' groups themselves. All these elements of Trotsky's and Mao's theories on the process of revolutionary change can be seen clearly in the tactics of the Trotskyist and Maoist factions in the 1960's in their attempt to direct the 'new' revolutionary student movements in France and the U.S.

When studying the old left groupuscules in France, it becomes apparent that due to the wealth of national historical traditions within that country, the Trotskyists and the Maoists have been irrevocably split. It is not necessary to go into all the evolutionary details here, but by 1968, there were three Trotskyist groups (two of which had student affiliates), and two Maoist movements (one of which was a youth movement).

The three main Trotskyist parties were the Parti Communiste Internationaliste (PCI) or Frankists, the Organisation Communiste Internationaliste (OCI), or Lambertists, and Voix Ouvrière.[7] Although the latter movement was involved in the barricades in May, the most interesting conclusions regarding infiltration of the 'Movement' can be drawn from the differences in character between the youth affiliate of the PCI, the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire and the youth branch of the OCI, the Fédération des Etudiants Révolutionnaires (FER). These groups had no respect for one another, as a report by the Prefecture of Police explained on June 11th 1968:

> "The militants of the FER denounce the plans of the JCR, which tend towards the creation of a new revolutionary party with a collection of hotheads and breakaway groups from the youths on the barricades."[8]

Herein lay one of the major points of contention between the JCR and the FER. The FER, strictly controlled by the OCI never viewed youth as a revolutionary vanguard. This was the hard brand of Trotskyism, with a higher degree of political exclusiveness, a more rigid doctrinal line and a tighter and more disciplined organisation. The FER was less confrontation oriented than the Frankists and in many ways considered itself more of a classical Marxist-Leninist group in the vein of Lenin's Bolshevik party, holding to the idea that "a successful socialist revolution requires both a material base and a highly conscious proletariat."[9] It often saw itself as upholding orthodox Trotskyism against the flirtations and triflings directed at youth and street violence advocated by the JCR. Most of the Fédération's leaflets in May 1968 were aimed directly at the workers, calling, for example, on the 13th May for "workers in all the factories, offices, building sites, victory depends on you alone!"[10]

The JCR however, was more 'liberal' in its interpretations of Trotsky. It has been said, indeed, that the JCR's practical political line was more Guevarist than Trotskyist, with its urban equivalent of Guevara's rural guerilla tactics and desire for direct confrontation.[11] This more unorthodox image of the JCR was enhanced by its adherence to the idea of Third World, non-industrialised revolution. As Alain Krivine, leader of the JCR, wrote in his book La Farce Electorale:

> "The impact of the Cuban Revolution and above all the Vietnamese Revolution, has given rise and wide diffusion to a new image of socialism, a new type of motivation in revolutionary action."[12]

Most important however was the faith which the JCR put in youth as a revolutionary elite: a spark to set off the impending upheaval in society by means of jolting the consciousness of a dormant working class. These marked differences between the two Trotskyist youth groups go some way to explaining the varying methods they used in May and June 1968 to stamp their own authority on the 'movement' as a whole.

The two Maoist groups in France in May 1968 were split into the hierarchical Maoists: the Parti Communiste Marxist-Leninist de France (PCMLF) and the anti-hierarchical Maoists; the Union des Jeunesse Communistes (Marxiste-Leniniste) (UJC(ml)). UJC(ml) had its origins in UEC (the young communists): students from the Ecole Normale Supérieure who were influenced particularly by the works of the pro-Chinese philosopher, Louis Althusser.[13] The young Maoists were to repudiate their mentor in 1967 however, claiming him to be a philosophical idealist, and turned instead, directly to the works of Mao himself.[14] They were profoundly sceptical of any attempt to exploit student grievances for revolutionary purposes, since they were convinced that only the workers could make a revolution. As their "self-criticism" explained in August 1968, after the 'événements de Mai': "In general the work of the Sorbonne soviet in May was very negative, combining sectarianism, the students' spirit of manipulation and too much opportunism."[15]

In a method referred to as enquête [16], in order to experience class exploitation first hand, it was incumbent upon militants to live among the people and share their existence. Daniel Singer's point that there was something of the Russian "narodniki"' or "populists" in the young French Maoists of the UJC(ml) is a valid one.[17]

As such, the UJC(ml) did not really know how to react to the events in May, particularly the early outbreak of violence and the Nights of the Barricades on 10th and 11th May. They took little, if any, part in the original spontaneous movement, and even condemned it, since they had always called for students to join the proletariat, not to encourage them to spearhead a revolution. All the same, the young Maoists were extremely active in left wing politics in the months preceding the explosion in May. They fought alongside young workers during vicious wildcat strikes at Caen and Le Mans in early 1968, and they were highly prevalent in the Vietnam Committees of 1967 and early 1968.[18] Indeed, as Belden Fields has argued:

> "Once the labour unions began to demonstrate support for the students and workers began to conduct massive strikes and plan occupations to the point of creating the spontaneous General Strike which paralysed France, then UJC(ml) joined forces with the broader movement by organising long marches out to the factories in support of the workers."[19]

Ultimately, the Maoists in UJC(ml) were just as eager as their Trotskyist rivals to lead the movement in the direction stipulated by their guru, Mao Zedong. Of particular significance was the young Maoists' essential adherence to

Mao's democratic centralism, and, in spite of their anti-hierarchical principles, their hatred for spontaneity and anarchism, and their desire to, if not exactly lead the revolution, then certainly direct it.[20]

American Trotskyism in the 1960s was quite markedly different from its counterpart in France. The Trotskyists in the United States were relatively cohesive in comparison with the French Trotskyists. Differences amongst American Trotskyists over party organisation tended to be fairly minimal, with no viable ideological models to work from. For the Trotskyists in the U.S., their founder's "Transitional Programme" took on a far greater significance than it did in France, where the extremists were working with a far more radically based working class. On the other hand, workers' control of the workplace or autogestion, was a far more important issue in France for the JCR than the American Trotskyist.(In France, the attempts at autogestion in the Nantes Commune might suggest at least an experiment of Trotsky's 'Dual Power' method of revolution.) One party has dominated U.S. Trotskyism since its creation in 1928, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP) under James Cannon, Rose Karsner and Max Schachtman. Schachtman went on to create an offshoot party, the Independent Socialist League (ISL) but Cannon's original party has always maintained its predominance.[21]

Both the SWP and the ISL youth affiliates, the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) and the Young People's Socialist

League (YPSL), were created in 1960. Trotsky's emphasis on youth was clearly illustrated by the amount of autonomy these groups had, separate from their adult counterparts. Of the two groups, the YPSL was to prove to be the most active within the SDS itself, in an attempt to reintroduce 'old left' principles and tactics. Important in this infiltration was Michael Harrington, along with Rachelle Horowitz and Tom Kahn. As American journalist and historian James Miller explained in his 1987 work "Democracy is in the Streets", the Trotskyists of the YPSL were attempting to infiltrate SDS a long time before the far more threatening Maoist Progressive Labour Party (PLP) practised its own entrism. Acquiring his information from an interview with Steve Max, an early New York SDS recruit, Miller worked out that attempts to influence SDS policy came as early as 1961. "Harrington's plan" Miller contended, "had always been that the YPSLs would take over SDS. They had a very concrete plan....and wanted to get a hold of the budget converting all the YPSL Chapters into SDS Chapters."[22]

The YSA on the other hand concentrated more on infiltration into the anti-Vietnam War groups, and specifically, the Student Mobilisation Committee (SMC). Hence, these approaches came later than those of the YPSL and experienced appreciably more success, mainly due to the choice of an issue which easily mobilised large numbers of supporters.[23] However, if one puts these moves into perspective, none of the Trotskyist groups could be said to have affected the student movement in the United States to the same extent as the Maoist Progressive Labour Party.[24] The Trotskyists in the U.S. were far more respectful of electoral processes than either of their counterparts in France, or the Maoists in the U.S, plus - a vitally important factor - they avoided, wherever possible, street confrontations.[25]

In contrast to this relatively tolerant attitude towards political activity of the American Trotskyists, the Maoist PLP militants were advocates of violent confrontationist politics. They called for the arming of the masses, believed in urban guerrilla warfare, (especially in the second half of the Sixties) and from 1964 onwards set their sights on a complete overthrow of the SDS.

The origins of Progressive Labour in the U.S. can be dated back to the 1961 split of the Communist Party USA (CPUSA). The rebel militants Milt Rosen and Mort Scheer began the crusade for the Chinese political line with the periodical "Progressive Labour" and by April 1965 this loose affiliation had evolved into the Progressive Labour Party. It is apparent from an account by Phillip Abbott Luce,(a former member of the PLP,) that there was a strong leaning in the party towards Mao's ideas of democratic centralism.[26] According to Luce, the party's 'bigwigs', the National Committee had a highly elitist and totalitarian approach to organisation, and manipulated the membership for their own ends. In theory, the leadership was intended to be responsible and responsive to the body of the PLP members, but in reality, Luce claimed, they made all the decisions with no consideration of the rank and file.[27] Of course, Luce's account must be placed in the perspective of his split with the party and their mutual bitterness, but nevertheless, his work gave invaluable insights into the workings of the young Maoists in PLP.

One of the main similarities between the 'old left' tacticians in both France and the U.S., Maoists and Trotskyists alike, was that they wanted to create a party or an organisation, rather than a mass movement with little or no definite direction. For most of the Marxist-Leninists, Maoists or Trotskyists, revolutionary dedication required long hours of work and study. Hence most of these groups, in the 1960s, condemned as irresponsible the expressive politics and personal style of the students of the Movements newly converted to revolution.[28] In France, undoubtedly the main 'old left' influence came from the splinter youth Trotskyist groups, the JCR and the FER.[29] To start with the JCR though, the documentary evidence makes it quite clear, that from the realisation that something might come from the spontaneous riots early in May, these young Trotskyists tried every means at their disposal to direct the movement with an avant-garde of elite, well-developed revolutionaries. As Bernard Brown has pointed out:

"The starting point of the JCR is the Leninist

> organisation of professional revolutionaries that would bring political knowledge to the proletariat. Hence, students and bourgeois intellectuals are destined to play the role of revolutionary vanguard after freeing themselves from class prejudices."[30]

Due to the entrist (infiltration) tactics of the JCR, many members of that organisation were also members of the neo-anarchist group led by Cohn-Bendit, the M22M. The most prominent example of this was Daniel Ben-Saïd, a former member of the JCR controlled 'Noir et Rouge' group.[31] Ben-Saïd was very vocal at strike committee meetings, usually in confrontation with Cohn-Bendit over the organisational structure of the movement.[32]

The emphasis on organisation can be observed in one particular leaflet of the 21st May 1968 distributed by the JCR, an obvious attempt to find a way to take control of the volatile situation and harness its spontaneity. They appreciated that the masses were vital, but they wanted a revolution on their terms:

> "Only the direct resolute action of the masses can force the Gaullist state to give way. They have spontaneously and massively applied this lesson in order to solve their own problems.....Let us consolidate our position. We should set up strike committees at base level in the factories, action committees in the faculties and neighbourhoods, gathering together and organising all the workers involved in the fight.[33]

Indeed, at various junctures, the Trotskyist militants in particular felt that they were losing control of the situation (for example, the 24th May, one of the worst nights of violence in May, when students began to uproot trees from the Paris streets to use in the barricades) and attempted to call the rioters back to regroup. So, the JCR militants mistrusted any unguided movement of the masses. As an article in the JCR's publication Avant Garde Jeunesse contended:

> "All those who believe that the workers' movement is capable by itself of elaborating an independent ideology, in which the workers reject the idea of a leadership, are mistaken, as Lenin himself would agree."[34]

More explicitly, a joint communique by the JCR, PCI and Voix Ouvrière on the 19th May, illustrates the general line of the Trotskyist elements in the May uprising:

> "In view of the developments in the present situation, which emphasise cruelly, the absence of a revolutionary leadership, and considering that it is indispensable to unify the struggle of those organisations which are based on Trotskyism, the representatives of the Communist Union (Workers' Voice), of the Internationalist Communist Party (French section of the 4th International) and the Revolutionary Communist Youth, met on Sunday 19th May 1968 and decided to form a permanent committee coordinating their 3 organisations. This committee calls on all the organisations which are based on Trotskyism to associate themselves with this initiative. The 3 organisations recommend their militants to contact each other everywhere, in order to coordinate the movement."[35]

The position of the FER splinter group is a little more complicated to analyse. On the nights of May 10th and 11th, when the original barricades were erected, the FER (probably under orders from its adult counterpart, the OCI)[36] attempted to disperse the students and ordered its own militants not to participate. The position of the FER militants was based on the premise that the revolution would have to come at the initiative of the workers, and not the students. They were extremely hostile towards the M22M and the JCR, but, similarly to the UJC(ml) Maoists, this group was still intimately involved in student affairs. The FER had infiltrated the National Students Union, UNEF, well before May 1968, attempting to influence its direction from within. As an indictment of the national leadership printed in the FER newspaper, "Révoltes" illustrated on April 28th 1968, FER was determined to revolutionise the UNEF. "To those who, like the leaders of UNEF, hide the truth from the students, hesitate and attempt to find a middle way, who do not open alternative perspectives of fighting; these ideas are bankrupt."[37]

As well, the militants of the FER had a similar attitude regarding the organisation of the workers to that of the JCR. Although their main preoccupation was with the workers, they did see the potential of the students as a possible catalyst and used that, as a May 6th leaflet demonstrated: "Men and women workers, young people, school pupils, students, apprentices, the students' fight is yours too."[38]

The FER's apprehension at uncontrolled anarchism and spontaneity was also stressed in much of its literature: "Without a revolutionary organisation defending the general interests of the working class and youth drenched in the class struggle confrontation, victory is simply not possible."[39] Again, in the same vein as the young Maoists of UJC(ml), FER joined the fray after the popularisation of the revolt by the workers at the mass demonstration in Paris on the 13th May.[40] After this, the young revolutionaries of the FER were at the forefront of strike activities, particularly the commune at Nantes, (where a Trotskyist "dual power" situation existed for a week, and workers took control of their workplaces with the red flag flying above the town hall), attempting to direct the struggle there.

Ultimately, the Maoist UJC(ml), as much as any other 'groupuscule', wanted control over the student-worker movement. Although the UJC(ml) claimed to be purely anti-hierarchical in organisation, the contradictions raised by Mao's democratic centralist policies are clear to see in the direction of the young Maoists in May and June 1968 in France. To them, without a revolutionary theory and a guiding group of revolutionary theorists there could be no movement. As an article in 'Garde Rouge' pointed out: "In order to navigate the sea, one must count on the helmsman. So in order to create a revolution one must apply the thought of Mao Zedong."[41] Hence, the militants of the UJC(ml) were highly prominent in the radicalisation of young workers in factories across the country, from the Renault works at Flins to the Nantes student-worker commune.[42] In fact, the evolution of the Maoist UJC(ml) attitude towards the student movement could be quite neatly correlated with that of the FER. Originally they were the least interested in student politics of all the 'old left' revolutionary groups, but the UJC(ml)'s attitude was turned by the mass demonstrations by the workers on May 13th 1968, and possibly more so by the sudden impulse to strike action by young workers across the country. They became totally supportive of the students, recognising their role in bringing about the radicalisation of the workforce. An article in the UJC(ml) newspaper "Servir le Peuple" on 17th May read:

> "By their tenacity, their resolution, their desire to link their struggle with that of the working class, which is the main force in the struggle against the big capitalist boss and the government, the mass of progressive students has been able to strike a resounding blow against Gaullism."[43]

Even the hierarchical PCMFL faction had played a part in the barricades in the early days of May, whilst its younger counterpart stood by and criticised[44], but in the light of the events of mid-May, the UJC(ml) realised the need to attempt to adapt Mao's theories to the French situation. As the young Maoists declared, on the 16th May:

> "It becomes indispensable for all the progressives to develop an exact idea of the actual situation, in order to thwart the plots of the bourgeoisie, and to adjust the student movement in a 'correct direction', in our revolutionary direction. To this

> end we must examine the threats to the student movement and what direction or orientation it must take."[45]

Compared with all the other 'old left' groups then, the Maoists in the UJC(ml) were no less insistent in attempting to control and steer the student movement through some form of revolutionary vanguard.

In the United States on the other hand, the situation was somewhat reversed. Contrary to the situation in France, where the student movement was under heavier siege from the Trotskyist element than the Maoists, in the U.S. the Maoist Progressive Labour Party faction posed by far the greatest threat to the development of the New Left in form of the SDS.[46] It seems from much of the literature that the SWP Trotskyists and their youth affiliate were not particularly violent or revolutionary groups, and indeed were quite constructive, in spite of the vicious repressive measures enacted against them. A. Belden Fields has argued, in his book, "Trotskyism and Maoism" that: "the antiwar work of the Socialist Workers Party and its YSA during the Vietnam War years provided an important element of disciplined work and organisational skills to a generally fluid movement."[47]

The Trotskyists did nevertheless attempt to stamp their ideological theories on the movement in the United States. Early in the Sixties in an article in the International Socialist Review, the SWP charged that:

> "The denial of the necessity for conscious and principled leadership by a vanguard combat party of the workers can only serve to disarm and derail the revolutionary movements and cause terrible deviations in the transition from the old order to socialism."[48]

Thomas Kahn, a prominent member of the Young People's Socialist League, wrote in 1962, "We must give the movement its ideology to the extent that we can make ourselves heard."[49] To Kahn and his companions, particularly Rachelle Horowitz and Richard Roman, this meant the politics of realignment, infiltration into the student movement and full scale political revolution.[50] However, the attempts by the YPSL to give ideological direction to the SDS were restricted to the very early years: up to possibly 1963-1964, by which time the YSA had begun to make its inroads into the peace movement, a far more fruitful venture for the Trotskyists.

An examination of the ideological evolution of both the SDS and the M22M will now provide some idea of each movement's responses to the threat of infiltration posed by the 'old left' factions. It is apparent from the literature that the SDS was far more ill-prepared to deal with such an onslaught than the M22M, and indeed, this fact manifested itself in the drastic changes that the SDS underwent throughout the Sixties. David Bouchier has roughly divided the ideological developments of the SDS into two distinct phases: the 'Port Huron period' (related to the ideas on, and critiques of American society stipulated in the "Port Huron Statement") and the 'New Marxism phase'.[51] Bouchier claims that the first phase was ending by 1966 and the second grew rapidly through 1967 and 1968 culminating in fragmentation of the SDS by 1969.

Although Bouchier's classification is somewhat oversimplified, a case can be made for a distinctive 'Port Huron' stage characterised by a general suspicion of anything ideologically based. Sprinzak has qualified this feature of the early SDS however: "It was very much against the traditional rigid ideologies, particularly the theory and practice of communist marxism, but it was in no sense anti-total ideology."[52] The early rejection of orthodox marxism as a viable model is clearly illustrated in possibly the most significant of new left documents, the "Port Huron Statement" or "Agenda for a Generation":

> "We of the left find no rest in theory and little hope in leadership. Marx, especially Marx the humanist, has much to tell us but his conceptual tools are outmoded and his final vision implausible. The revolutionary leaders of the rising nations have been mostly non-ideological - either forced to be so, or preferring (as in the case of Guevara) to forge their political views in the heat and exigencies of revolution and the present."[53]

Much of the early SDS work was concerned with individual issues. The new young radicals were generally concerned with protesting a specific injustice or working for a concrete cause, and often, such actions were motivated more by vague emotional feelings or expediency, rather than any predetermined, rigid ideological goals. Tom Hayden, one of the earliest and most significant SDS leaders, wrote in an article for The Activist in Winter 1961:

> "Let us join together in action wherever we agree upon the specific, isolated issue, regardless of our differences over any other issues; let us find an ideology "inductively", through group action, rather than starting with an ideology and running off into sectarian courses to spar."[54]

This quotation sums up quite accurately the attitude of the early New Left leaders in the U.S. toward both traditional and potentially 'new' ideologies. It also goes some way to explaining certain difficulties the New Left in the U.S. would experience later in the decade, as a consequence of this essential expediency. This point was clearly illustrated by a pamphlet aimed at American students in 1968, entitled "The Mass Strike - France, May/June 1968", in which the French authors pointed out:

> "One of the serious limitations of the American student movement has been its failure to deal with the source of its radical energies in the oppression of students. Instead radicalism has meant devotion to redressing the wrongs of others. The result is that student radicals appear as outsiders in other people's struggles rather than as members of a group whose own interests require joint activity with other groups."[55]

Such a perspective essentially meant that SDS's ideological development would be evolutionary, and would lack the more sudden revolutionary transformation that attracted more impatient radicals to more extreme strains of Marxism-Leninism. The desire for homogeneicy and simplicity in ideological description eventually affected the SDS's programme for action later in the 1960s. Straightforward and immediate action seemed far more attractive than that which involved long tedious and complicated movement work, such as the ERAP project.[56] Criticisms by the regional Chapters of SDS, directed against the original tactics of the SDS central leadership in Chicago, became more widespread by the spring of 1966 as impatience and frustration grew. As an article in the Chicago based SDS newsletter, New Left Notes, illustrated: "In summary then, SDS as a national organisation has been unable to provide substantial strategy and political content for the New Left."[57] It was in this context of increasing disillusionment that Progressive Labour was to become an increasingly magnetic force. From 1962 to 1965, PLP dominated the anti- imperialist group, the May 2nd Movement (M2M). Lawrence Lader sees this as the first open identification between student groups and the Marxist-Leninists, as the leader of the M2M, Russell Stetler was also a member of SDS.[58] The M2M had many of the characteristics of Progressive Labour: rigid Marxist-Leninist doctrine, centralised bureaucracy and conspiratorial secret meetings.

However, by 1966, the M2M had expired, and in February 1966, a tactical decision was taken by the leadership of the PLP to infiltrate the SDS.[59] Its own youth group was on the wane and, in looking for a new youth forum, SDS seemed a ready made target: an established youth organisation with a large following. PLP proceeded to attempt to move into the largest and most important SDS Chapters, particularly Boston, New York and the Bay area in California (fortunately for PLP, these were strongholds of the Maoists). They would take control, eventually hoping to win over the national structure of SDS. According to Phillip Abbott Luce, they achieved the greatest success at the Harvard Chapter in Boston, where they were able to outvote other elements, rather than convert them to 'old left' Marxism-Leninism.[60] Progressive Labour was effectively the only faction within SDS that could claim a sharply defined programme, and indeed, its Maoist rigidity filled an ideological vacuum for many student radicals. In interview with Kirkpatrick Sale for Sale's 1973 work SDS, Jeff Shero, a prominent SDS leader from the University of Texas, commented:

> "Progressive Labour had a comprehensive ideological structure with which they could interpret the world, and at any time, on any subject, they could give a classical Marxist analysis of what the problems were and rally their solid support behind that....They had an ideological tradition - and it was almost impossible to solidify a counteranalysis to that."[61]

Connected with this ideological vulnerability on the part of the National Office of the SDS in Chicago, there was also a general reluctance to concern itself in any way with the history of factional conflict within the American Communist Party. This complete lack of information about, or interest in, the debates and squabbles that had devoured the old left wing in America appears to have been quite crucial in the ultimate demise of the New Left. The fatal policy set up by the SDS in 1962 of "ideological non-exclusionism", (which, as its title suggests, was a policy whereby no political groups or individuals could be prevented from joining the movement, irrespective of ideological leanings) illustrates this ignorance of the problems faced by the old left quite aptly. As late as 1965, a mimeographed SDS pamphlet written by a founding member of the organisation, Al Haber, provides an example of the symptoms of the later failure still looming large:

> "There shall be no *a priori* ideological formula of who shall be in and who out of the democratic radical movement.....Although there *is* internal 'ideological control', it operates individually through continual debate. It assumes that people in the organisation are essentially honest and themselves open to persuasion." [62]

Protagonists of this "ideological non-exclusionism" defended it on the basis of the New Left's original principles of openness and universality. Unfortunately, it obviously meant that any hell-bent or suicidal group could jeopardise the potency of the overall movement. The dilemma was never worked out though, and this early idealism contributed greatly to later factionalism and fragmentation in the movement, since it allowed easy infiltration particularly of the PLP.[63]

The evolutionary development of the SDS then, was characterised by an increasing need to deal with the ideological question, and in particular, the necessity of finding a way to counteract the ever growing impact of the Maoists in PLP. The fortunes of the New Left in the United States were followed quite closely throughout the Sixties by a one-time member of Progressive Labour, Phillip Abbott Luce.[64] He gave his impressions of the 'demise' of the SDS in a 1971 work:

> "In the beginning, the N.L. understood that something was amiss in this nation...(rejecting both the political situation in the U.S. and the Soviets' socialist alternative)... As a result, what is still rhetorically referred to as the New Left, is in reality, only a Dorian Grey picture of the original visions of its founders."[65]

The first real attempts by the SDS leadership to stave off this threat from the 'old left' can be seen in the emergence of what Lawrence Lader has called 'Prairie Power' at the Iowa National Convention in August 1966.[66] Lader has seen this as the development of an anarchistic element in the New Left, characterised by a decrease in control for the central National Office in Chicago, where SDS had its base, and an increase in the autonomy of local SDS Chapters. At the Iowa Convention, the SDS 'old guard' were pushed out for good [67], with the election of Nick Egelson as President, Carl

Davidson as Vice-President and Carl Oglesby as National Secretary.[68] This new element was influenced by the "Wobblies", who had their origins from as far back as the pre-World War One era.[69] They attempted to provide a firmer structure, continuity and ideological grounding for the SDS as a counterbalance to the Marxist-Leninist and Maoist rhetoricians. In particular, Davidson considered the problem most seriously, and in his pamphlet "Towards a Student Syndicalism", (often considered as an extension of the "Port Huron Statement"), he visualised a Federation of Students Unions based on the campus, but organising strikes and boycotts in the surrounding community to link students and workers in a permanent radical force:

> "What would happen to a manipulative society if its means of creating manipulative people were done away with? Every SDS Chapter should organise a student syndicalist movement on its campus....the issue for us is student control."[70]

This document was particularly significant, because in its definite claim for students to take control of their universities lay possibly the only chance for the New Left (if sufficient resources and time had been committed) to develop a truly original ideological interpretation of American society. It was also the last real opportunity the SDS leadership had of rallying the mass of radical students around a concrete ideological issue, against the threat presented by Progressive Labour.[71] Indeed, the ideas of these 'Prairie

Power' activists could be interpreted as an attempt to steal the thunder of the PLP Maoists, as could the simultaneous development in the New Left under the title of the Radical Education Project (REP). REP was a research project intended to overcome the gaping theoretical holes in the SDS's armour, to educate the membership and to provide a practical channel for long term action. As the founding document of REP pointed out:

> "There is a need for competent research on the issues of left programme and theory. It is no recent revelation that the theoretical framework of the left needs development in terms of the contemporary character of imperialism, capitalism, mass culture, technology, abundance, and in terms of the experience of socialist revolutions and American reforms."[72]

The subsequent pamphlets of the REP (often reprints of articles from left wing journals such as the National Guardian, the Socialist Register and Liberation) in fact remained pretty loyal to the "Port Huron Statement", and usually accurately conveyed to SDS members the ideological struggles going on at the time.[73] Unfortunately however, the REP pamphlets were not widely read, a feature of the SDS which David Bouchier has pointed to quite accurately: "The history of SDS can be seen as a series of failures by the leaders to communicate with their followers."[74]

Hence, by 1967 and into 1968, the slip into orthodox Marxism began to run a faster course, and carried with it all the usual accompanying pitfalls of factional strife and sectarianism. Although the PLP was not actually capturing control of the SDS, its actions were having quite definite effects. It had, at the very least, contributed to pushing the whole organisation to the left. By the Spring of 1968, virtually all the national leaders considered themselves 'revolutionaries'. Particularly significant was the election of Bernadine Dohrn, who had declared herself to be a "revolutionary communist", as Inter-Organisation Secretary. As Kirkpatrick Sale pointed out: "In effect, Progressive Labour pushed SDS towards Marxism by forcing it to build its own Marxist front against P.L. domination."[75]

Similarly, the creation of the "New Working Class Theory", at the SDS national conference in Princeton (originally called to discuss the progress of the REP) in February 1967, had heralded the beginnings of a strained attempt to apply Marxist class analysis to immediate needs, that is, a bulwark against the PLP. The term 'vanguard' came into American New Left language for the first time, conjuring up images of Trotskyist and Leninist styled rhetoric and revolution.[76] In fact, the major split in the SDS became apparent at the April 1968 Columbia riots in New York. When the spontaneous riots and teach-ins began in response to the building of a university gymnasium on a Harlem recreation area, both factions of the SDS contributed their suggestions as to how the activism should be channelled. The ideological conflict lay between the Maoists' desire for a 'basebuilding' approach at the level of the masses, and the National Office counter-offensive of 'vanguard actions' or 'exemplary actions'.[77] This split shows remarkable similarities with the conflict in France between the Trotskyist JCR strategy and the Maoist UJC(ml) line.[78] By the SDS Convention on the 26th December 1968 at Ann Arbor, Michigan, the movement had moved from a radical student organisation to a tumultuous and factionalised revolutionary movement, and this factionalism had rent the organisation in two across the nation.[79] Favoured tactics of the PLP at SDS National Conventions were the obstructing and diverting tactics particularly in evidence at the SDS Conference in June 1968. These actions included shouting down speakers and chanting Maoist slogans throughout Conference meetings.[80]

The National Office in Chicago by this stage was trying to outradicalise the PL faction and, under Mike Klonsky, the newly-created Revolutionary Youth Movement (which emerged out of the ashes of the original SDS) attempted to build an ultra-left that would make the Maoists seem timid and bureaucratic in comparison. Whilst Progressive Labour concentrated only on the proletariat as the revolutionary class, the Revolutionary Youth Movement encompassed a broad range of groups under the banners of black rights, the poor, campus unions and students in general, working class youth and street gangs.[81]

By 1968, the pages of the SDS newspaper New Left Notes were cluttered with either ongoing debates between the PLP Maoists and SDS, or alternatively, long quotations from Chairman Mao.[82] All the 'newness' of the New Left, the original idealism and libertarianism, humanism and morality, had disappeared, to be replaced by a mere radical outcropping of the 'old left'. The original spontaneity, irrationality and subjectivity of what was essentially an expedient revolt had been successfully perverted by the ideologues.

In the French situation on the other hand, one outstanding feature of the attempted control of the student movement by the 'old left' was the extremely hardened attitude of the New Left activists towards such infiltration techniques. How much of an impact did the Maoist and Troskyist groupuscules really have on the development of the student revolt in Paris in May 1968? Both the FER and the UJC(ml) were to admit their underestimation of the role played by the student revolt later in the struggle. Particularly on the 'Nights of the Barricades' of May 10th and 11th, both groups' sympathies with the workers made them mistrust purely student objectives, rejecting the temptation of direct action and an attack on the Sorbonne.[83] However, of all the 'old left' groupuscules, the Trotskyist splinter group, the JCR, has been most frequently seen as the most formidable pressure group on the extreme left, and that which both initiated and characterised the movement.[84] Although, as a report made by the Préfecture de Police pointed out, "the leaders and militants of the JCR in the course of the week from the 6th to 11th May, played an important role in the lulls between demonstrations and street violence"[85], the JCR was in fact one of the slowest groupuscules to realise what was happening. Jane Decker saw this as possibly the result of the fact that the militants of the JCR had "come to believe the ongoing centrality and importance which the press had assigned them."[86]

The M22M on the other hand, was active constantly throughout the revolt and subsequent strike, attempting to uphold the principles of spontaneous and violent action from the base. As early as the 26th April, a bulletin of the movement's plenary session illustrated the determination of the M22M's activists not to lose control of the rapidly increasing student radicalism: "We are just as determined to avoid being taken over by any single political left wing group as by the administration and liberal lecturers."[87] So whilst the Trotskyists and Maoists shared a belief in the need for a corps of professional revolutionaries, (accepting Marxism-Leninism as a base) the anarchists and surrealists generally repudiated Leninism and its stress on the necessity for a revolutionary vanguard party, preferring to rely on the various exponents of socialism in the nineteenth century mentioned earlier such as Sorel and Le Bon. In an interview with Sartre, Cohn-Bendit outlined the fears the enragés had with regard to revolutionary strategy: how to develop a practical theory based on an awareness of one's condition without letting that theory degenerate into a rigid confining ideology, and how to make use of organisational structures (which clearly would facilitate revolutionary action) without setting the groundwork for bureaucracy and hierarchy.[88] This was something Cohn-Bendit wanted to avoid at all costs, and hence, he and his colleagues in the M22M refused the temptation to evolve either a coherent ideology or a structured organisation.

Nevertheless, Cohn-Bendit mused after the event, there was some early infiltration into the M22M by the Trotskyists:

> "Direct democracy implies direct management. Hence, though the M22M at first included a number of convinced Bolsheviks, Trotskyists and Maoists, its very structure was opposed to the Bolshevik conception of a proletarian vanguard. Small wonder then, that quite a few Trotskyist groups such as the FER eventually left the movement while those who stayed behind did so as an expedient in the hope of using the movement to strengthen their own organisation. In May and June, there were several attempts to establish the "true revolutionary party" which the working class 'so sadly lacked'."[89]

Of great significance are two fairly well reported meetings, in which this question of an organised revolutionary party caused severe friction. One was a meeting on May 9th called by, and for, the M22M (although, after the outbreak of violence on May 3rd, all other groups were invited to participate in discussion). The other was a Press Conference held at the Sorbonne on June 1st. Both of these events illustrate quite clearly attempts by Trotskyist infiltrators to stamp their authority on the movement.[90] Daniel Ben-Saïd was a particularly outspoken critic of the M22M for what he called "neglect of leadership and of a political line". He continued:

> "The construction of a revolutionary organisation must be our objective....the vanguard groups must not be dissolved into the mass movement....Our task is to structure the movement in some precise places, to create an epicentre."

Cohn-Bendit's response was predictable enough:

> "I don't give a damn about the UJC(ml)'s or the others' appreciation of the groupuscules. If the Trotskyists, the Maoists and my grandmother go into the streets we shall all be together, if not, they can go to hell. I accept dialogue with everybody but there is no more time for verbiage; we want democracy to go into the streets. Our movement of 22 March is against hegemonies."[91]

Cohn-Bendit seemed to be always attempting to keep the initiative with the rank and file. At the June 1st press conference, he argued, again with Ben Said, against the proposed creation of a Mouvement Révolutionnaire as a means of coordinating the Comités d'Action from a central base:

> "That is why we, in any case, a part of the M22M condemn today's initiative, because it seems to us premature, because the problem has not yet been thoroughly discussed by the rank and file.... We also know that, for us, it is of no interest to pose the problem again in terms of a vanguard

structure."[92]

An examination of the way in which the May contestation developed indicates that the ideas of Cohn-Bendit and the M22M came closest to embracing the true spirit of spontaneity and direct action so characteristic of the movement. Through the process of provocation by a small minorité agissante (active minority), the enragés were able to transform the latent discontent of the mass of students into a potentially revolutionary force. As Cohn-Bendit himself pointed out:

> "In reality, everything hangs on the use of provocation in the crystallisation of thought and emotion....All we did therefore was to provoke students to express their passive discontent, first by demonstrations for their own sake, and then by political actions directly challenging modern society."[93]

For the most part, when the militants of the Trotskyist and Maoist groupuscules tried to recruit a vanguard from within the student movement, it turned out that the overwhelming majority of the unorganised intended to stay that way, without any sign of apathy.[94] Hence, in spite of the ultimate failure of the revolt, the original principles and ideals of the M22M were perverted less by the 'old left' factions in France than those of the SDS in the United States. Undoubtedly, the militants of the various groupuscules participated decisively at certain junctures in the students' revolt and workers' strike, but ultimately, it is fair to say, they were more successfully integrated into the movement than leaders of it.[95]

ENDNOTES TO CHAPTER THREE

1. The exceptions to this pattern include, A. Belden Fields, *Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the United States*, D. Bouchier, *Idealism and Revolution: New Ideologies of Liberation in Britain and the United States*, E. Sprinzak, "Democracy and Illegitimacy. A study of the American and French student Protest Movements and some theoretical implications", and Irving Louis Horowitz, *Ideology and Utopia in the U.S. 1956-76*.

2. In France, the prominent Trotskyist groups were the *Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire* (JCR) and the *Fédération des Etudiants Révolutionnaires* (FER) and the main Maoist group was the *Union des Jeunesse Communistes (Marxistes-Leninistes)* (UJC(ml)). In the U.S, the most influential group was the Maoist Progressive Labour Party (PLP), and the main Trotskyist groups were the Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) and the Young People's Socialist League (YPSL).

3. See A. Belden Fields, *Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the United States* pp.9-13.

4. For Trotsky's ideas of Permanent Revolution, Dual Power and the transitional programme expanded see Leon Trotsky, *The Transitional Programme for Socialist Revolution* (New York; Pathfinder, 1974).

5. Directive of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party dated June 1st 1943 written by Mao from Stuart Schram, *The Political Thought of Mao-Tse-Tung* (New York; Praeger, 1963) pp.316-17.

6. Quotation from Mao taken from J.W. Lewis (ed) *Major Doctrines of Communist China* (N.Y. W.W. Norton & Co, 1964) pp.101-2.

7. For a clear summary of the development of these splits, see A. Belden Fields, *Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the United States*. The Frankists were followers of Pierre Frank after the 1952 split over *entrism* into the PCF, whilst Pierre Lambert and his supporters created the OCI believing that such *entrism* compromised the principles of the Trotskyists. This split lasted until 1968. *Voix Ouvrière* whose name was taken from the title of its newspaper developed out of Barta's 1939 group *L'Union Commmuniste Internationaliste* (UCI).

8. From a section of the "*Préfecture de Police*" report of June 11th entitled "*L'aspect politique de la situation*" (transl. from French).

9. A. Belden Fields, Trotskyism and Maoism p.70.

10. Leaflet circulated by the FER on May 13th "Le combat est engagé" (transl. from the French).

11. See A. Belden Fields, Trotskyism and Maoism p.59.

12. Alain Krivine, "La Farce Electorale" (Paris; Seuil, 1970) p.68-9.

13. Althusser was a Professor at the Ecole Normale Supérieure who encouraged many of his students to leave UEC with his criticisms of theoretical sterility, but was subsequently left behind by the members of UJC(ml) who made the total transition to Maoism.

14. For a summary of the UJC(ml) split with UEC and their early dependence on the philosopher Althusser see their 'Autocritique' written in August 1968, p.6.

15. 'Autocritique', August 1968 - Pamphlet of the UJC(ml), p.7.

16. Literal translation 'Enquiry'.

17. D. Singer, Prelude to Revolution, p.57. The term "narodniki" refers to the students in Tsarist Russia in the 1870s, who preached revolution to the peasantry across the country, and more often than not were handed over to the authorities by the peasants.

18. See "Servir Le Peuple", the UJC(ml) journal, for reports on the progress in Vietnam and the French campaign dated 15th February 1968.

19. A. Belden Fields, Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the U.S. p.93.

20. For the UJC(ml)'s views on democratic centralism and the need for an 'Avant-garde', see the January 1968 edition of 'Garde Rouge' and the article "Le centralisme démocratique est une importante garantie pour l'application de la ligne révolutionnaire du président Mao. This article also illustrates the Maoists hatred of anarchists.

21. For a chronological development of the Trotskyists in the U.S., see Appendix 3 in Belden Fields, Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the U.S. p.295.

22. James Miller, 'Democracy is in the Streets': From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago (New York; Simon and Schuster, 1987) p.74-5.

23. Phillip Abbott Luce, The New Left Today: America's Trojan Horse (Washington DC; Capitol Hill Press, 1971) p.133-9.

24. See M. Cantor, The Divided Left pp.211-2.

25. A. Belden Fields, Trotskyism and Maoism pp.167-71.

26. Luce was associated with the Communist Party from 1961. He turned more militant, joining Progressive Labour in 1963. He rose quickly in the hierarchy until he became Editor of the magazine 'Progressive Labour', and had been amongst those selected to visit Cuba illegally. In 1965 however, Luce left the PLP, disliking its strong arm tactics and reliance on violence, and proceeded to commence a campaign attempting to expose the totalitarian elements of Progressive Labour and the attempt to control the New Left, and specifically SDS.

27. Luce, The New Left Today: America's Trojan Horse p.78.

28. See L. Lader, Power on the Left p.178 or A. Belden Fields, Trotskyism and Maoism p.186.

29. Other groupuscules involved in the May revolt in Paris included the Tendance Marxiste Révolutionnaire Internationaliste (TMRI) and Tendance Marxiste-Révolutionnaire de la Quatrième Internationale.

30. B. Brown, Protest in Paris p.76.

31. For information on the role of Daniel Ben-Saïd, see the June edition of the Trotskyist newspaper Etudiant Révolutionnaire, 1968. p.4.

32. See the extracts from a press conference of the M22M held on June 1st 1968 at the Sorbonne from Vladimir Fisera(ed.) Writing On The Wall. France May 1968: A documentary anthology (New York; St. Martin's Press, 1978) pp.180-185.

33. Working leaflet from the JCR dated May 21st. The only title given is "Travailleurs, Etudiants..." (Transl. from the French).

34. Avant Garde Jeunesse 18th May 1968. Article entitled "Lutte étudiantes, lutte ouvrières" p.2, (transl. from the French).

35. Joint communique of Voix Ouvrière, Parti Communiste Internationaliste and Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire, 19th May.

36. See P. Seale and M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag p.85. Also see J. Gretton, Students and Workers p.92.

37. From an article entitled "L'Hésitation de nos dirigeants est criminelle" dated 27-28 April, 1968 from the FER journal 'Révoltes'.

38. Leaflet distributed by the Fédération des Etudiants Révolutionnaires on 6 May 1968 entitled 'For the creation of a Revolutionary Youth Organisation', from Vladimir Fisera, Writing on the Wall. France May 1968: a documentary anthology. p.92.

39. "Supplément de Révoltes No. 17" FER 28th April 1968 p.6, (transl. from the French).

40. Daniel Singer believes that FER joined the revolt between May 13th and May 17th. See Singer, Prelude to Revolution p.153.

41. Article entitled "le centralisme démocratique" from the Maoist journal 'Garde Rouge' January 1968. p.63.

42. See P. Seale and M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag pp.57 & 164-5.

43. Article entitled "Le drapeau rouge des ouvriers flotte sur Renault. A bas le régime Gaulliste anti-populaire: from 'Servir le Peuple' 17th May (UJC(ml)) (transl. from the French).

44. See UJC(ml)'s 'Autocritique' dated August 1968. p.11.

45. "Déclaration de L'UJC(ml) A propos des récents événements" 16th May p.1. of a 3 page leaflet (transl. from the French).

46. For this interpretation, see M. Cantor, The Divided Left p.212, L. Lader, Power on the Left p.216 or J. Miller, "Democracy is in the Streets" p.139.

47. A. Belden Fields, "Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the U.S. p.182.

48. Article entitled "Who will change the World? The New Left and the views of C. Wright Mills" from the Summer 1961 issue of The International Socialist Review, organ of the SWP. p.69.

49. Thomas Kahn, "The Political Significance of the Freedom Rides" from The New Student Left: An anthology (M. Cohen and D. Hale (ed.) p.71.

50. James Miller, "Democracy is in the Streets" pp.74-5.

51. See D. Bouchier, "Idealism and Revolution" p.46.

52. E. Sprinzak, "Democracy and Illegitimacy" p.121.

53. From the "Port Huron Statement, Agenda for a Generation" reprinted in M. Cohen and D. Hale (ed.) The New Student Left: An Anthology p.3. (The Statement was actually issued in 1962).

54. Tom Hayden, an article from the Oberlin radical journal The Activist entitled "A letter to the New (Young) left" taken from M. Cohen and D. Hale, The New Student Left p.5-7.

55. Branch Pamphlet 3. "The Mass Strike France, May/June 1968" p.2.

56. D. Bouchier, Idealism and Revolution p.63. Also see Carl Davidson's National Secretary Report, "From Protest to Resistance, printed in New Left Notes 13th January 1967.

57. From an article entitled "In search of a Radical Ideology" dated April 19th 1966 from New Left Notes p.2. Also see D. Bouchier, Idealism and Revolution p.46 for the impatience of the various SDS local Chapters.

58. L. Lader, Power on the Left. p.177.

59. See M. Cantor, The Divided Left p.212 or L. Lader, Power on the Left p.216.

60. P.A. Luce, The New Left Today: America's Trojan Horse, p.97. Belden Fields also gives some interesting statistics regarding the strength of Progressive Labour at Harvard. One half of the Harvard SDS group were PLP in 1966 and of 200 voting delegates at the SDS convention in the Summer of 1967, approximately 40 or 50 were disciplined PLP members. p.189.

61. Interview with Jeff Shero in K. Sale, S.D.S. (New York; Random House, 1973) p.398.

62. See Al Haber's pamphlet entitled "Non-Exclusionism, Participatory Democracy and Direct Action", taken from M. Teodori, The New Left: A Documentary History p.219-20.

63. See R. Fraser, 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt p.309 for the SDS's tolerance, and D. Bouchier, Idealism and Revolution p.44 & p.71, or I. Unger, The Movement pp.88-9 for the abuses of this situation.

64. Luce is perhaps a useful case study of the gradual integration of the disciplinarian Progressive Labour Party into SDS and the New Left Movement. His original libertarian ideas on individual freedoms etc. were abused when he became more and more aware of the rigid controls placed on PLP members. Having occupied influential positions in the PLP,

(before his conversion) Luce was in a position to become aware of infiltration tactics into the New Left Movement. The introductory sentence to his work The New Left Today reads: "I left the N.L. (New Left) six years ago. Since then, I have been an active witness to the total degeneration of what began as an idealistic movement into the depths and despairs of a totalitarian and 'old' (in the sense of ideology, theory and practice) movement. The N.L. now stands as a symbol of all the evils usually associated with the 'old left' i.e. the communist party and/or the Trotskyites." Taken from Luce, The New Left Today: America's Trojan Horse p.xi.

65. Luce, The New Left Today p.xi.

66. L. Lader, Power on the Left p.212.

67. 'Old guard' refers to the original signatories of the 1962 Port Huron Statement and is a general term for the early humanist-moralist-idealists of the movement.

68. L. Lader, Power on the Left p.212.

69. The 'Wobblies' correct name was the I.W.W. (International Workers of the World) and this group was an extremist anarcho-syndicalist styled movement which originated out of the violent industrial disputes at the turn of the twentieth century.

70. See Carl Davidson's article "Towards a Student Syndicalism" from New Left Notes dated September 9th, 1966, p.2 and p.11.

71. See D. Bouchier, Idealism and Revolution pp.62-5.

72. See "Ask not what REP...." from New Left Notes, August 24th, 1966 for the major aims and intentions of the project p.7 and p.31.

73. For an example of this, see the National Guardian, February 24th 1967.

74. D. Bouchier, Idealism and Revolution.. p.70.

75. K. Sale, S.D.S. p.398-402. Also, for the Bernadine Dohrn quotation see p.451.

76. It is most likely that the creation of the "New Working Class Theory" was considered necessary to counteract PL's "Worker-Student Alliance", in which young Maoist students took up temporary factory jobs over the Summer of 1967 to carry the antiwar message to the Assembly Lines. There was certainly a spate of articles in New Left Notes in 1967 calling for a

greater awareness of the working class as a potentially revolutionary class. One particular article on February 13th 1967 called on SDS activists to familiarise themselves with the works of Antonio Gramsci, Serge Mallet and Andre Gorz, highlighting the vital importance of the student movement as the vanguard of this new emerging class of professional, technical, clerical and social workers.

77. For examples of these conflicts between the Maoists and the National Office, see New Left Notes throughout May 1968, and the ongoing discussions between the 'Action Faction' and the 'Praxis Axis'.

78. Again, this split between the N.O. and the Maoists has been categorised as the difference between an 'Action Faction', which advocated spontaneity and volatile uprising that could later be fitted into a theoretical plan, and a 'Praxis Axis', which called for an ideological base for each step in the revolutionary process.

79. R. Fraser, 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt pp.308-309.

80. Richard Peterson, "Student Left in American Higher Education" from Lipset and Altbach (ed.), Students in Revolt p.206.

81. Edward J. Bacciocco, The New Left in America: Reform to Revolution 1956-1970 (Stanford, Hoover Press, 1974) pp.215-20.

82. For the PLP, SDS debates, see for example "Towards a Revolutionary Student Movement" in New Left Notes, December 23rd, 1968 p.3, whilst a few of Mao's quotations can be found in the same issue of New Left Notes p.1 and p.4.

83. For an account of the Trotskyist and Maoist hesitation on the 'Night of the Barricades' see A. Touraine The May Movement. pp.173-4. For a more partisan impression of that first violent weekend, see Daniel and Gabriel Cohn Bendit, Obsolete Communism: The Left Wing Alternative. This account, although necessarily treated with some caution, is very useful as a source for the tactics of the various groupuscules.

84. For examples of this viewpoint see P. Seale and M. McConville, Red Flag, Black Flag and D. Singer, Prelude to Revolution.

85. Report filed on the content and form of the student movement by the Préfecture de Police, dated 21st May 1968, entitled, "Compartement des groupements d'extrème gauche et de leurs dirigeants (transl. from the French).

86. J.E. Decker, "A Study in Revolution Theory: The French Student-Worker Revolt" p.198.

87. M22M Bulletin no. 5494. Preliminary text for the Movement's Plenary Session 26th April. Taken from V. Fisera, *The Writing on the Wall* p.80.

88. See D. Cohn-Bendit from H. Bourges(ed), *The Leaders Speak* in interview with J-P. Sartre, p.92.

89. Daniel and Gabriel Cohn Bendit, *Obsolete Communism: The Left Wing Alternative*. p.199.

90. Extracts from the Press Conference can be found in P. Vidal-Naquet and A. Schnapp (ed.) *Journal de la Commune Etudiante. Textes et Documents Nov. 1967-Juin 1968* (Paris; Ed. du Seuil, 1969) pp.407-415, whilst the Meeting of the 9th May is quoted in V. Fisera, *Writing on the Wall* p.98-100.

91. V. Fisera (ed) *Writing on the Wall* p.99-100. Daniel Ben Said was somewhat of an enigma before and during the May events. It would seem that the majority opinion leads to the conclusion that he was a member of the JCR who was often used to infiltrate other organisations (as a part of the JCR's *entrism* policy). Before May, he had been important in the rise of the CVN (*Comité Vietnam National*) but by the first week in May he emerged as an activist in the M22M.

92. P. Vidal-Naquet and A. Schnapp, *Journal de la Commune Etudiante* p.411, (transl. from the French).

93. G. & D. Cohn-Bendit, *Obsolete Communism* p.55.

94. See "Branch Pamphlet 3" *The Mass Strike May/June 1968* p.8.

95. See *Paris: May 1968. Solidarity Pamphlet No 30* or "Branch Pamphlet 3" *The Mass Strike May/June 1968* pp.7-8.

CONCLUSION

If one were to compare the scale of the student movements in France and the United States, the most significant factor would have to be the mobilisation of the working classes. May 1968 in France was undoubtedly a potentially revolutionary situation. However, the Paris student revolt without the participation of the workforce in the general strike would probably have remained just that: a localised student rebellion (and one which would eventually have dissipated). Students cannot bring society to a standstill by rebelling alone, particularly since they are not active or productive members of society. In the U.S, only the Vietnam War seemed capable of bringing the Sixties movement out of the campus and mobilising non-student support. The working classes were never really considered as a viable revolutionary force in the U.S. by the New Left. Indeed, if there was anything truly original in the American New Left, it was the attempt to create a radical or revolutionary force out of a collection of groups which did not include the working class. Hence, the American political system was never really under the kind of threat faced by the Gaullists in France. There was never a revolutionary situation in the United States during the 1960s.

To move more specifically within the actual student movements themselves, ideologically speaking, the reason for the French movement's greater resiliance in the face of 'old left' pressure, when compared with its American counterpart, can be seen in the necessity for any political movement to have some form of coherent ideology. Ideologies are necessarily derived from one's own experiences and traditions. In France, there was no shortage of historical precedence to work from. Unfortunately however, in the United States, what little tradition the radicals had at their disposal was more often than not squandered or ignored. This led to student politics characterised by expediency and a preoccupation with specific issues, and undoubtedly, it was this pragmatism without an ideological base which proved to be the SDS's downfall.

Hence, the radical students of the M22M seem to have been far more successful in attempting to deal with the internal threats posed by the 'old left' factions than their American counterparts in the SDS. Not only did they have a wealth of radical and revolutionary traditions to refer to, but they had the good sense to use them.[1] As a result, the French students had answers to the probing questions and attacks thrown at them particularly by the Trotskyist groups.[2] There was a libertarian tradition in France dating back to the revolutionary theorists of the nineteenth century, and evidence shown here illustrates that it had been studied by the young student revolutionaries in 1968. In the SDS on the other hand, there seemed to be a reluctance to take time to learn from the lessons of the past. In their desperate attempt to be 'new', the American student activists completely neglected study of what few radical traditions there were in the U.S, and hence had little ideological ammunition with which to defend themselves against the onslaught from Progressive Labour.

Also, the French movement was ideologically based. The French student radicals were not afraid of constantly redefining their ideological stance against the more orthodox 'old leftists', and as a result, did not collapse under the pressure exerted by the Trotskyists for stricter organisational discipline and leadership. In the U.S. however, SDS activists tended to be very tentative when using the term ideology, and they seemed incapable of, or unwilling to provide the movement with a unifying ideal or ideology. Instead, they preferred to attempt to rally the movement around individual issues such as the war in Vietnam or civil rights in the southern states. Basically, the American New Left tended to be based on an expediency which lacked an ideological framework, and hence there was no real ideological depth to the movement. Because it relied on fighting other people's injustices to amass support, SDS created little or no internal stability for itself. Consequently, when the Maoist Progressive Labour Party began to infiltrate the ranks of SDS in 1966, with its detailed and complex (and historically based) ideological arguments, SDS crumbled under the pressure. All that the student radicals of SDS could do to defend themselves was to rush into an ill-prepared, basic Marxism by 1967-68 that would have seemed unthinkable to the original founders of the movement. The French movement had an ideological foundation that provided it with a certain stability. Unfortunately for SDS, it lacked this ideological foundation which David Bouchier considers so vital to a radical movement:

> "The dynamic core of a radical movement has to be its expression of the vision, the values, and the social analysis which will accomplish this change of consciousness. Ideologies give direction to the demand for change and give the radical movement whatever coherence and meaning it has for its followers."[3]

ENDNOTES TO CONCLUSION

1. See comments by Daniel Cohn-Bendit, Jacques Sauvageot and Alain Geismar in The Leaders Speak: The French Student Revolt, May 1968 Also see "Liberty or Death", an interview with Cohn-Bendit by Jean Jacques Lebel and Jean-L. Brau, from the pamphlet "Liberty or Death" edited by Mary Beach (San Francisco; City Lights Books, 1968) pp.18-32.

2. See V. Fisera, Writing on the Wall. May 1968: A Documentary Anthology pp.98-100 & 180-85. Also see the interview with Cohn-Bendit in "Liberty or Death" pp.18-32.

3. D. Bouchier, Idealism and Revolution p.10.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

CONTEMPORARY PERIODICALS, JOURNALS AND NEWSPAPERS

FRANCE

Avant Garde Jeunesse
Cahiers de Mai
Combat
Etudiant Révolutionnaire
Feuille ANARchiste
Garde Rouge
L'Humanité
Humanité Nouvelle
Le Libertaire
Révoltes
Servir Le Peuple
Situationniste Internationale
Voix Ouvrière

UNITED STATES

The Activist
International Socialist Review
Liberation
National Guardian
New Left Notes
New Left Review
Ramparts Magazine
Studies on the Left

PRIMARY RESEARCH MATERIAL

FRANCE

1. Leaflets and documents from the 'Tracts de Mai' collection from the Bibliothèque Nationale de Zurich

- Communiqué du SNESup - Vendredi, 17 Mai, 1968

- Notes from L'Assemblée Générale de la Sorbonne - May 19th 1968

- Report by Le Comité de Grève de Lycée Voltaire - May 1968

- Comité Vietnam National(CVN) leaflet entitled "Pour la Victoire du peuple Vietnamien" January 22nd 1968

- Comité Vietnam de Base leaflet, "Pourquoi lire le courrier de Vietnam?" February 1968

- CVN leaflet entitled "Salute the glorious Vietnamese workers" n.d.

- Comité National d'Action leaflet. "Manifestation pour le peuple Vietnamien, February 13th 1968

- Conférence de Presse (Alain Geismar; leader of SNESup) 12th May 1968

- Leaflet distributed by the Fédération des Etudiants Révolutionnaires, entitled "Le Combat est Engagé" 13th May 1968

- Pamphlet published by the Union des Jeunesses Communistes Marxistes-Leninistes), entitled Autocritique, August 1968

- Working leaflet by the Jeunesse Communiste Révolutionnaire, entitled "Travailleurs, Etudiants..." 21st May 1968

- Leaflet by the FAF Sécrétariat aux Relations Internationales, entitled "Camarades" 25th May 1968

- Pamphlet by the Comité des Enragés (Situationist International) & the "Council for the Continuation of the Occupations", entitled "An address to all workers", 30th May 1968

- Pamphlet distributed by the Comité d'Action pour la Révolution Socialiste des Régions, entitled "Décolonisons la Provence contre l'oppression capitaliste" 30th May 1968

- Leaflet entitled, "L'Intervention de Cohn-Bendit" 28th May 1968

- Préfecture de Police reports:

  - "L'aspect politique de la situation" June 11th 1968

  - "Compartement des groupements d'extrème gauche et de

leurs dirigeants" 21st May 1968

2. Ayâche, Alain, (ed.) Les Citations de La Révolution de Mai (Paris; Jean-Jacques Pauvert éditeur, 1968)

3. Beach, Mary (ed.), "Liberty or Death" (San Francisco; City Lights Books, 1968)

4. Besançon, J. (ed.) Les Murs ont la Parole: Journal Mural, Mai 1968 (Paris; Claude Tchou éditeur, 1968)

5. Bourges, H. (ed.) The French Student Revolt: The Leaders Speak (N.Y. Hill & Wang, 1968)

6. Cohn-Bendit, D & G. Obsolete Communism: The Left Wing Alternative (London; Deutsch, 1968)

7. Mai '68: Début d'une Lutte Prolongée (London; Dobson Books Ltd, 1969) Texts and Posters by Atelier Populaire

8. Solidarity pamphlet, No. 30. "Paris, May 1968"

9. Vidal-Naquet, P. and A. Schnapp, Journal de la Commune Etudiante. Textes et Documents. Nov. 1967 - Juin 1968. (Paris; Seuil, 1969)

UNITED STATES

1. SDS Working Papers:

- "Port Huron Statement, Agenda for a Generation" (June 1962)
- "America and the New Era" (June 1963)
- "Non-Exclusionism: The New Left and the Democratic Left" (mimeographed SDS pamphlet by Al Haber. 1965)
- "Radical Education Project" (August 1966)
- "Towards a Student Syndicalism" (Written by Carl Davidson, Sept 1966)

2. Speeches:

- Paul Potter, "The Incredible War" (Anti-War rally, Washington DC, 17th April 1965)

- Carl Oglesby, "Trapped in a System" (27th October 1965)

- Greg Calvert, "In White America. Radical Consciousness and Social Change" (Speech at Princeton Conference, February 1967)

3. Mandel, E. "The Lessons of May 1968: The Commune Lives" (Pamphlet directed at students in the United States, first published in New Left Review. No. 52. Nov-Dec 1968)

SECONDARY WORKS

Aptheker, B. The Academic Rebellion in the United States (New Jersey; Citadel Press, 1972)

Ardagh, K. The New French Revolution (New York; Harper, 1969)

Arendt, H. Crises of the Republic (New York; Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Inc., 1969)

Aron, R. The Elusive Revolution: Anatomy of a Student Revolt (New York, Praeger Publishers, 1969)

Bacciocco, E.J. The New Left in America: Reform to Revolution 1956-1970 (Stanford; Hoover Institute Press, 1974)

Baynac, J. Mai Retrouvé: Contribution À l'histoire du Movement Révolutionnaire du 3 Mai au 16 Juin 1968 (Paris, éditions Robert Laffont, 1968)

Belden Fields, A. Trotskyism and Maoism: Theory and Practice in France and the United States (New York; Autonomedia, 1988)

Bloch-Michel,J. Une Révolution de la xx Siècle. Les Journées de Mai, 1968 (Paris, Robert Laffont, 1968)

Bouchier, D. Idealism and Revolution: New Ideologies of Liberation in Britain and the United States (London; Edward Arnold, 1978)

Brau, J.L. Cours Camarade: le Vieux Monde est Derrière Toi (Paris; Albin Michel, 1968)

Breines, W. Community and Organisation in the New Left 1962-1968: The Great Refusal (New York; Praeger, 1982)

Brown, B.E. Protest in Paris: Anatomy of a Revolt (New Jersey; General Learning Press, 1974)

Calvert, G. & C. Nieman A Disrupted History: The New Left and the New Capitalism (New York; Random House, 1971)

Cantor, M. The Divided Left: American Radicalism 1900-1975 (N.Y; Hill & Wang, 1978)

Cohen, M. & D. Hale The New Student Left: An Anthology (Boston; Beacon, 1966)

Crick, B. & W.A. Robson Protest and Discontent (Baltimore;

Penguin, 1970)

Decker, J.E. "A study in revolutionary theory. The French student worker revolt of May 1968". (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University 1972)

Douglas, J.D. Youth in Turmoil - America's changing youth cultures and student protest movements (Washington DC; D.H.E.W., 1970)

Ehrenreich, B & J. Long March, Short Spring: The Student Uprising at Home and Abroad (N.Y; Monthly Review Press, 1969)

Ellsworth, F. & M.Burns Student Activism in American Higher Education (Washington DC; The America Personnel and Guidance Association, 1970)

Fraser, R. 1968: A Student Generation in Revolt (N.Y; Pantheon, 1988)

Fisera, V. Writing on the Wall. France May 1968: A Documentary Anthology (New York; St. Martins Press, 1978)

Foster, J. & D. Long Protest! Student Activism in America (N.Y; William Morrow & Co Inc, 1970)

Fromm, E. The Sane Society (New York; Rinehart, 1955)

Geismar, A. Vers la Guerre Civile (Paris, Publications Premières, 1969)

Gerberding, W.P. & D. Smith The Radical Left: The Abuse of Discontent (Boston; Houghton Mifflin, 1970)

Gitlin, T. The Whole World is Watching - Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left (Berkeley; University of California Press, 1980)

Glazer, N. Remembering the Answers - Essays on the American Student Revolt (New York; Basic Books, 1970)

Gretton, J. Students and workers: An analytical account of dissent in France May-June, 1968 (London; Macdonald, 1969)

Guerin, D. L'Anarchisme (Paris; Gallimard, 1965)

Hanley, D.L. & A.P. Kerr Contemporary France: Politics and Society since 1945 (London; Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1984)

------ *May '68* (London; Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1987)

Harrington, M. *Decade of Decision: The Crisis of the American System* (N.Y. Simon & Schuster, 1980)

Horowitz, I.L. *The Struggle is the Message: The Organisation and Ideology of the Antiwar Movement* (Berkeley; Glendessary, 1970)

------ *Ideology and Utopia in the U.S. 1956-1976* (Berkeley; Glendessary Press, 1980)

Howe, I. (ed) *Beyond the New Left* (New York; McCall Publishing, 1970)

Kelly, M. *Modern French Marxism* (Baltimore; John Hopkins University, 1982)

Keniston, K. *Youth and Dissent: The Rise of a New Opposition* (New York; Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971)

------ *Radicals and Militants: An Annotated Bibliography of Empirical Research on Campus Unrest* (London; DC Heath, 1973)

Kerr, C. *The Uses of the University* (Massachusetts; Harvard University Press, 1963)

Krivine, A. *La Farce Electorale* (Paris; Seuil, 1970)

Labro, P. *Les Barricades de Mai* (Paris; Solar, 1968)

------(et al) *Ce n'est qu'un Début* (Paris; Publications Premières, 1968)

Lader, L. *Power on the Left: American Radical Movements Since 1946* (New York; W.W. Norton, 1979)

Lefebvre, H. *The Explosion: Marxism and the French Revolution* (New York; Monthly Review Press, 1969)

Lipset, S.M. *Rebellion in the University* (Boston; Little, Brown and Co., 1972)

Lipset, S.M. & P. Altbach *Students in Revolt* (Boston; Little, Brown and Co, 1969)

Lipset, S.M. & S. Wolin *The Berkeley Student Revolt* (New York; Garden City, 1965)

Lothstein,A.(ed) *"All we are saying...": The philosophy of* the New Left.

Luce, P.A. The New Left Today: America's Trojan Horse (Washington DC; Capitol Hill Press, 1971)

Makhno, N. La Révolution Russe en Ukraine (Paris; Seuil, 1968)

Mandel, E. The Revolutionary Potential of the Working Class (N.Y. Pathfinder, 1974)

Marcuse, H. Eros and Civilisation: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud (Boston; Beacon, 1955)

------- One Dimensional Man (Boston; Beacon, 1964)

Mcevoy, J. & A. Wadsworth Black Power and Student Rebellion (Belmont; Miller Publishing, 1969)

Miller, J. Democracy is in the Streets: From Port Huron to the Siege of Chicago (New York; Simon and Schuster, 1987)

Mills, C.W. The Power Elite (New York; Oxford University Press, 1956)

Morin, E. Mai 1968: La Brèche: Premières Réflexions sur les Evénements (Paris; Fayard, 1968)

------- La Commune Etudiante (Paris; Fayard, 1968)

Nagel, J.(ed) Student Power (London; Merlin Press, 1969)

Nugent, N. & D. Lowe The Left in France (London; Macmillan Press, 1982)

Phillips, D.E. Student Protest 1960-1970: An analysis of the Issues and Speeches (New York; University Press of America, 1985)

Poperen, J. Une Stratégie pour la Gauche (Paris; Fayard, 1969)

Priaulx, A. & S.J. Ungar The Almost Revolution: France 1968 (N.Y. Dell Publishing Co. Inc, 1969)

Rand, A. The New Left Anti-Industrial Revolution (New York; Signet, 1971)

Reader, K. Intellectuals and the Left in France (New York; St. Martins Press, 1987)

Riesman, D. The Lonely Crowd: A study of the Changing American Character (New Haven; Yale University Press, 1950)

Romm, E.G. The Open Conspiracy: What America's Angry Generation is Saying (New York; Giniger, 1970)

Root and Branch The Mass Stike in France 1968 (Massachusetts; Root and Branch Pamphlets, 1970)

Sale, K. S.D.S. (New York; Random House 1973)

Sampson, E. & D. Korn Student Activism and Protest (San Francisco; Jossey Bass, 1970)

Sartre, J.P. Les Communistes ont Peur de la Révolution (Paris; John Didier, 1968)

Schram, S. The Political Thought of Mao-Tse Tung (New York; Praeger, 1963)

Seale P. & M. McConville Red Flag, Black Flag: French Revolution, 1968 (New York; G. Putnam's Sons, 1968)

Servan-Schreiber,J.J. Le Réveil de la France Mai-Juin 1968 (Paris; Denoël, 1968)

Singer, D. Prelude to Revolution: France in May 1968 (New York; Hill and Wang, 1970)

Sprinzak, E.Z. "Democracy and Illegitimacy. A study of the American and French student Protest Movements and some theoretical implications" (Ph.D. dissertation. Yale University, 1971)

Teodori, M.(ed) The New Left: A Documentary History (Indianapolis, Bobbs-Merrill, 1969)

Trotsky, L. The Transitional Programme for Socialist Revolution (New York; Pathfinder, 1974)

Unger, I. The Movement: A History of the American New Left 1959-1972 (New York; Harper and Row, 1974)

Weaver,G.R. & J.H.Weaver(ed) The University and Revolution (New Jersey; Prentice Hall Inc., 1969)

Woodcock, G. Anarchism (London; Penguin, 1963)

Young, N. An Infantile Disorder? The Crisis and Decline of the New Left (London; Routledge, Kegan and Paul, 1977)